Welcome to your CDP Climate Change Questionnaire 2021

C0. Introduction

C0.1

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

At Mondelēz International(MDLZ), our purpose is to empower people to snack right by delivering the right snack, at the right moment, made the right way. That means delivering a broader range of delicious, high-quality snacks that nourish life's moments, made with sustainable ingredients and packaging that consumers can feel good about.
With global net revenues of $26.6 billion in 2020, we are leading the future of snacking with our iconic global and local brands such as Oreo, belVita and LU biscuits; Cadbury Dairy Milk, Milka and Toblerone chocolate; Sour Patch Kids candy and Trident gum. Our snacks are enjoyed by consumers in over 150 countries, and we have operations in more than 80 countries, with close to 80,000 employees in our factories, offices, research & development facilities and distribution activities around the world. Our business operates in 4 regions, with Europe and North America representing the largest share of 2020 net revenue.
Guided by our purpose, we are forging ahead in our own distinctive way to make snacking right for everyone. We're focused on making our snacks more sustainable by using less energy and water and creating less waste, while using ingredients consumers know and trust. We have specific, time-bound goals to which we hold ourselves accountable and we're continuing to make progress and scale our efforts to deliver meaningful change. As a global company, Mondelēz International aims to lead where we matter most, and drive change where the world needs it most, ultimately creating a future where people and planet thrive. Our sustainability goals focus on reducing key end-to-end environmental impacts. In 2020 we released new public, ambitious goals to achieve by 2025:

- Scaling our Cocoa Life sustainability program so that Cocoa Life will produce 100% of the cocoa volume we require for our chocolate brands
- Scaling human rights due diligence to 100% of Cocoa Life communities in West Africa
- Scaling Harmony Wheat to source 100% wheat for biscuits in Europe (by 2022)
- Achieving 100% traceable forest-monitored palm oil and continued 100% RSPO certified
- Setting science-based targets to reduce end-to-end CO2 emissions by 10%, with a focus on protecting and restoring forests
- Reducing 10% of water usage in priority areas where water is most scarce
- Reducing 15% of food waste in manufacturing and 50% from distribution

- Advancing packaging innovation and tackling plastic waste with 100% of packaging designed to be recyclable and labelled with recycling information, and 5% reduction in overall virgin plastic & 25% reduction in virgin rigid plastic over 2020 base
- Including portion amounts and mindful snacking information on all packages globally
- Invest in innovative Sustainable Futures impact investment ventures and funds

We work together in collaboration with partners, external advisors, regulators and stakeholders, to focus on maximizing our long-term positive impact. Every year, external experts update our enterprise wide carbon footprint that enables us to track and report our emissions and identify carbon hot spots that help shape our priorities and goals. We are committed to transparent reporting of our impact and progress against our goals, which we publish in our annual Snacking Made Right report.

Forward-Looking Statements

This CDP submission contains forward-looking statements. Words, and variations of words, such as “will,” “expect,” “anticipate,” “estimate” and similar expressions are intended to identify these forward-looking statements, including, but not limited to, statements about climate-related risks and opportunities. These forward-looking statements are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties, many of which are beyond Mondelēz International’s control, which could cause Mondelēz International’s actual results to differ materially from those indicated in these forward-looking statements. Please see Mondelēz International’s risk factors, as they may be amended from time to time, set forth in its filings with the SEC, including its most recently filed Annual Report on Form 10-K and Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Mondelēz International disclaims and does not undertake any obligation to update or revise any forward-looking statement in this submission, except as required by applicable law or regulation.

C0.2

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
Reporting year	January 1, 2020	December 31, 2020	No

C0.3

(C0.3) Select the countries/areas for which you will be supplying data.

Argentina
Australia
Austria
Bahrain
Belgium
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Brazil
Bulgaria
Canada

Chile
China
China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
Colombia
Costa Rica
Croatia
Czechia
Denmark
Ecuador
Egypt
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Ghana
Greece
Honduras
Hungary
India
Indonesia
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Japan
Kazakhstan
Lebanon
Lithuania
Malaysia
Mexico
Morocco
Netherlands
Nicaragua
Nigeria
Norway
Pakistan
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Puerto Rico
Romania
Russian Federation
Saudi Arabia
Serbia
Singapore
Slovakia

Slovenia
South Africa
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Taiwan, Greater China
Thailand
Turkey
Ukraine
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Uruguay
Viet Nam

C0.4

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

USD

C0.5

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

Operational control

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

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

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

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

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

Row 1

Primary reason

Do not own/manage land

Please explain

We do not own or manage land, though we do work directly with farmers through our Cocoa Life, Harmony, and other agricultural initiatives. We consider agricultural emissions in our climate disclosure and report emissions from land use change (including deforestation) related to agriculture. Since 2009, we (and our predecessor company) have performed a lifecycle assessment of the air, water, and land impacts of our operations, from farm through consumption and disposal. Agriculture is by far the largest impact on air, water, and land, which is why we invest in sustainable agriculture.

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

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

Agricultural commodity

Wheat

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

40-60%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one product category as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.

Agricultural commodity

Sugar

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

More than 80%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one or more of our product categories as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.

Agricultural commodity

Other, please specify

Cocoa and cocoa products

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

20-40%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one or more of our product categories as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.

Agricultural commodity

Palm Oil

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

60-80%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

The percent of revenue is a rough estimate. We are reporting revenue from one or more of our product categories as outlined in our 2020 Form 10-K. For this CDP response, we are using the 10K reported revenue for a category if an estimated majority of products in that category uses the selected commodity, even though not all the products in the category use the commodity selected in CDP.

C1. Governance

C1.1

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

Yes

C1.1a

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

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board-level committee	Within our Board, we have a Governance, Membership and Public Affairs Committee (Governance Committee) - - made up of three or more non-employee members - who is directly responsible for overseeing policies and programs related to corporate citizenship, social responsibility and public policy issues significant to MDLZ. This includes sustainability and environmental responsibility, marketing and packaging and covers critical sustainability policies, programming, strategy development and progress on related KPIs. For example, our Governance Committee reviewed our sustainable ingredients focus on key raw materials including cocoa and palm oil to promote sustainable agriculture and prevent deforestation. The Governance Committee is also responsible for monitoring issues, trends, internal and external factors and relationships that may affect the public image and reputation of MDLZ and the food and beverage industry, such as sustainability issues, deforestation and climate change.
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Our CEO, who is also the Chairman of the Board of Directors (the Board), reviews and gives final signoff on our Snacking Made Right Impact Strategy. In 2020, the CEO approved our 2025 public commitments in sustainable snacking, including our commitment to reduce deforestation through sourcing 100% of the cocoa volume for our chocolate brands sustainably through our Cocoa Life program, a 10% reduction of end to end emissions, and a 10% absolute reduction in water at priority manufacturing sites. As head of the Mondelēz International Leadership Team (MLT), our executive committee, the CEO approves sustainability strategy, programming and required budget proposed by our VP and Chief of Global Impact (our CSO) as part of our strategic planning process. The CEO approves key performance indicators and has direct responsibility for the company's delivery on these commitments.

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Please explain
Scheduled – some meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues	The Governance Committee is responsible for overseeing sustainability as part of our Snacking Made Right impact strategy and receives regular briefings from our CSO. Its members are directly responsible for overseeing environmental & social sustainability, including climate change, circular packaging solutions and social impact. This oversight covers critical sustainability policies, programming, strategy development & progress on related key performance indicators. Our ERM process includes consideration of climate change risks, which in turn incorporates deforestation-related risks. It is ongoing & implemented at all levels of our operations & across business units to identify, assess, monitor, manage and mitigate risk. It also facilitates open communication between management and the Board, so that the Board & committees understand key risks to our business and performance, and the functioning of our risk management process, including who participates in the process and the information gathered in the assessment. Annually, the Audit Committee reviews and approves management's recommendation for allocating to the full Board or another committee, or retaining for itself, responsibility for reviewing and assessing key risk exposures and management's response to those exposures. Management presents and provides reports to the Board or the appropriate committee on key risks & the actions management has taken to monitor, control and mitigate these risks.

C1.2

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

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	Half-yearly
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify Executive Vice President, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs	Other, please specify Oversees climate-related risks and opportunities	Half-yearly
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Half-yearly
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify Executive Vice President & Chief Supply Chain Officer	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Half-yearly
Sustainability committee	Managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Half-yearly

C1.2a

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

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

Our CEO, who is also the Chairman of the Board, reviews and gives final signoff on our Snacking Made Right impact strategy, covering social and environmental responsibility. In 2020, our CEO approved our 2025 public commitments in sustainable snacking, including our commitment to reduce deforestation through sourcing 100% of the cocoa volume for our chocolate brands sustainably through our Cocoa Life program, a 10% reduction of end to end emissions, and a 10% absolute reduction in water at priority manufacturing sites. As head of the MLT, our executive committee, the CEO approves sustainability strategy, programming and required budget proposed by the CSO as part of our strategic planning process. The CEO approves key performance indicators and has direct responsibility for the company's delivery on these commitments.

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

Our CSO chairs a cross-functional Impact Steering Committee (ISC) with members from our key global functions and regions to manage our sustainability strategy. Our CSO regularly reports on sustainability to our CEO quarterly and to the Board Governance Committee. In partnership with a team of Senior Directors who act as subject matter experts on sustainable

ingredients, environmental impact, sustainable packaging and social sustainability, the CSO leads the strategy development process and oversees the strategy through to implementation. In addition to setting our strategic roadmap for meeting our 2025 commitments, the CSO is responsible for the long-term sustainability vision for the company. The CSO oversaw the process of setting and validating our SBTi to reduce our end-to-end emissions 10% by 2025.

Executive Vice President, Corporate & Legal Affairs and General Counsel

Our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs is the executive sponsor of the Sustainability Committee, Mondelēz International's cross-functional committee, chaired by our CSO with members from our key global functions and regions. As the executive sponsor, our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs meets more than quarterly with the committee to review progress and to align on key developments in the sustainability strategy including our carbon action plan and programming around water, waste and sustainable ingredients. Our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs is also part of the Mondelēz International Leadership Team (MLT) and has responsibility for the oversight of sustainability at the executive leadership level along with the CEO. In partnership with other MLT members, our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs approved the proposed 2025 commitments.

Executive Vice President & Chief Supply Chain Officer

Our Chief Supply Chain Officer (CSCO) sits on the Mondelēz International Leadership Team, which directly reviews and approves strategy, programming and the required budget proposed by the CSO as part of our strategic planning process. The CSCO oversees procurement, manufacturing and logistics and therefore reviews the forests-related agenda and helps deliver the KPIs for each of these areas in partnership with the business units.

Sustainability Committee

Our sustainability strategy is managed by a cross-functional sustainability committee, which is chaired by our CSO and includes members from our key global functions and regions, The committee meets more than quarterly to review progress and to align on key developments in the sustainability strategy. Executive sponsorship is provided by our EVP, General Counsel, Corporate & Legal Affairs, and our EVP and President, Europe. In addition to providing strategic guidance, members of the sustainability committee help to address challenges and provide resources for sustainability integration across the business.

C1.3

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

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

C1.3a

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

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity inventivized	Comment
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Monetary reward	Supply chain engagement Other (please specify) Sustainable packaging	The Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Mondelēz International designs our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) to motivate our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) to achieve or exceed our annual financial and strategic goals. Our AIP includes a set of metrics – weighted at 20% – that measure progress against key strategic initiatives and are directly linked to the three pillars of our business strategy: growth, execution, and culture. Within the execution pillar, two key performance indicators relate to sustainability. The first measures our progress towards sourcing 100% of cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life by 2025. The second relates to the percentage of our packaging designed to be recycle-ready.
Corporate executive team	Monetary reward	Supply chain engagement Other (please specify) Sustainable packaging	The Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Mondelēz International designs our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) to motivate our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) to achieve or exceed our annual financial and strategic goals. Our AIP includes a set of metrics – weighted at 20% – that measure progress against key strategic initiatives and are directly linked to the three pillars of our business strategy: growth, execution, and culture. Within the execution pillar, two key performance indicators relate to sustainability. The first measures our progress towards sourcing 100% of cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life by 2025. The second relates to the percentage of our packaging designed to be recycle-ready.

All employees	Non-monetary reward	Emissions reduction project Energy reduction project Environmental criteria included in purchases Supply chain engagement	For non-monetary: Each business unit has sustainability on their strategic plan and is held accountable. Therefore, incentives come in the form of internal recognition (publicly recognized by the CEO or highlighted with the Board, etc.) and external recognition (press releases, customers, etc.), which can drive incremental business.
Corporate executive team	Non-monetary reward	Other (please specify) achievement of commitments and targets	Our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) are expected to lead the business to meet our sustainability goals, including reducing our energy usage, water consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and waste generation as well as increasing our sustainable sourcing practices and design of recycle-ready packaging. To this end, our executive team get positive ratings and rankings in addition to positive investor feedback. Therefore, incentives come in the form of internal recognition (publicly recognized by the CEO or highlighted with the Board, etc.) and external recognition (press releases, customers, etc.), which can drive incremental business.
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	Monetary reward	Supply chain engagement Other (please specify) Sustainable packaging	The Human Resources and Compensation Committee of the Board of Mondelēz International designs our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) to motivate our CEO and other members of our executive team (MLT) to achieve or exceed our annual financial and strategic goals. Our AIP includes a set of metrics – weighted at 20% – that measure progress against key strategic initiatives and are directly linked to the three pillars of our business strategy: growth, execution, and culture. Within the execution pillar, two key performance indicators relate to sustainability. The first measures our progress towards sourcing 100% of cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life by 2025. The second relates to the percentage of our packaging designed to be recycle-ready.

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

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

Yes

C2.1a

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

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	1	Our short-term climate-related and financial goals are aligned (i.e., both look to one year ahead). Our programs related to climate change look at yearly goals to address longer-term issues. For finances, we also consider up to one year to be a short-term issue.
Medium-term	1	6	For medium-term, our climate-related and financial reviews are different. The numbers provided here for the time horizon are for climate-related issues. For climate-related issues, we currently consider medium-term risks/opportunities to be those that may arise between one to six years ahead. This aligns with our 2025 goals, which address longer-term climate-related issues. For financial issues, we consider medium-term risks/opportunities to be those that may arise between one to three years ahead.
Long-term	6	30	For long-term, our climate-related and financial reviews are different. The numbers provided here for the time horizon are for climate-related issues. For climate-related issues, we consider potential effects to thirty years and beyond. As an example, our goal to reduce CO2 in manufacturing aligns with current approaches to setting science-based targets to support the global effort to limit climate change to well below 2ºC, which take a long-term approach. For finances, as a general matter, our long-term horizon is three to ten years, depending on the issue.

C2.1b

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

We consider impact to be substantive if it is of an equivalent magnitude to criteria used to assess risks in our Enterprise Risk Management framework at the level of “major” or above. We use the following criteria to define major impact in any given year:
1. Financial: operating income changed by 1 percent or more.
2. Reputational: major brand impact less than a 1 year, due to negative national media, public, social media or political attention. Requires global or region team to manage partner relationships and public image.
3. Legal (risk only): violation of law potentially leading to serious sanctions and/or fines/penalties
4. Operational: major operational failure - business impacted for days: people, process and/or technology.

This definition applies to both direct operations and supply chain.

C2.2

(C2.2) Describe your process(es) for identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities.

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

Annually

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term
Long-term

Description of process

Our business faces various risks, including strategic, financial, operational and compliance risks. Identifying, managing and mitigating our exposure to these risks, along with effective oversight of such matters, are activities critical to our operational decision-making and annual planning processes. Management is responsible for the day-to-day assessment, management and mitigation of risk. The Board has ultimate responsibility for risk oversight, but it has delegated primary responsibility for overseeing

risk assessment and management to the Audit Committee. Pursuant to its charter, the Audit Committee annually reviews and discusses our enterprise risk management ("ERM") process, and global and business unit assessment and risk mitigation results. Our ERM process is ongoing and implemented at all levels of our operations and across business units to identify, assess, monitor, manage and mitigate risk. Our ERM process facilitates open communication between management and the Board, so that the Board and committees understand key risks to our business and performance, and the functioning of our risk management process, including who participates in the process and the information gathered in the assessment. Annually, the Audit Committee reviews and approves management's recommendation for allocating to the full Board or another committee, or retaining for itself, responsibility for reviewing and assessing key risk exposures and management's response to those exposures. Management provides reports to the Board or the appropriate committee on key risks and the actions management has taken to monitor, control and mitigate these risks. Management also attends Board and committee meetings to discuss these reports and provide any updates. The committees report key risk discussions to the Board following their meetings. Board members may also further discuss the risk management process directly with members of management .

While the Board oversees risk management, the ERM process is overseen by the Risk and Compliance Committee (MRCC). The executive sponsors of the MRCC are the EVP and Chief Financial Officer, and the EVP and General Counsel. MRCC oversees the ERM process to identifies, assesses and mitigates and monitors key risks to the company. Ownership of specific risks is assigned at the Leadership Team (MLT) level (MLT members report directly to the CEO).

The risk universe considered during this process is wide and varied (including environmental and social sustainability) and considers external emerging trends, strategic and operational priorities over the next 3 years horizon .

ERM methodology includes periodic risk register refresh, annual reviews with all business units, leveraging a risk mapping process that considers risk impact, (financial/ reputational/ legal/ operational), velocity, likelihood and preparedness. Based on the specific risk drivers, we develop our risk response strategies, which can be either mitigation (action plans), transfer (insurance), avoidance, or acceptance.

We have identified a specific risk pertaining to Environment and Social Sustainability (ESS). Our sustainability-related risk assessment is guided by our ERM process; analysis of stakeholder and regulatory issues; our total greenhouse gas, land use, and water footprint; proprietary consumer insight data; and publicly available data on societal issues, including statistics and reports from authorities, non-governmental organizations, and peer companies.

The following industry challenges related to climate change, sustainability, and wellbeing are captured in the ERM framework and ESS risk analysis:
• Efficacy of ESS structure, program, resources, and governance

• Climate change (e.g., extreme weather, rising temperatures) impacting raw material availability and supply chain logistics
• New government regulations and/or taxes & tariffs (sugar tax/ obesity Tax)
• Changing consumer preferences and expectations
• Manufacturing, marketing, labor, and supply chain practices
• Increasing investor and stakeholder expectations for risk mitigation

Relevant risks that could materially affect our business and financial results are disclosed in the Annual Report on Form 10-K and included in section C2.3a below.

Value chain stage(s) covered

Upstream

Risk management process

A specific climate-related risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term

Description of process

As stated in 2020 10-K Annual Report (at page 7 of the document): “A number of external factors such as changing weather patterns and conditions, commodity market conditions, currency fluctuations and the effects of governmental agricultural or other programs affect the cost and availability of raw materials and agricultural materials used in our products. We address higher commodity costs and currency impacts primarily through hedging, higher pricing and manufacturing and overhead cost control. We use hedging techniques to limit the impact of fluctuations in the cost of our principal raw materials; however, we may not be able to fully hedge against commodity cost changes . . . and our hedging strategies may not protect us from increases in specific raw material costs. . . . [W]e continue to monitor the long-term impacts of climate change and related factors that could affect the availability or cost of raw materials, packaging and energy.”

We use various multi-dimensional tools and models throughout the company to support the identification of risks to facilitate timely and effective risk for our agricultural commodity supply chains. This includes on and off-site compliance monitoring, data analytics, and trend analysis for key commodities. For example, several current cocoa growing areas are at acute physical risk of becoming unproductive over the long term due to climate change. This affects several countries and regions globally. To identify these risks, we rely on in-depth assessments performed by international research organizations, such as International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT). Through supplier evaluations within our Cocoa Life program, farmers and partners increasingly

cite 'weather-related events' as a leading cause for declining cocoa yield and declining viability of local farming businesses.

Our sustainable agriculture programs, like Cocoa Life, help us respond to climate-related risks by promoting resiliency and climate adaptation through improved farming practices and natural resource conservation. Through this programming, we also engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives, such as the Cocoa & Forest Initiative, which formulates an aligned sector and government response to increase local forest coverage and adopt good environmental growing practices.

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

Annually

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term

Description of process

At the asset level, we do business continuity planning for a variety of business matters. We have a business plan to react to disruptions caused by a given crisis, including potential facility interruptions, key sourcing interruptions and system interruptions. In addition we use insurance to protect our financial interest and to provide financial resource to support the extra expense associated with executing our business continuity plans where possible.

We operate a Global Environment & Safety (E&S) Standards and Management System that involves crisis preparedness / risk management. At the asset level, facilities worldwide are required to assess E&S risks including asset-level risks and facility-level risks and implement these standards to address those risks.

We use various multi-dimensional tools and models throughout the company to support the identification of risks to facilitate timely and effective risk management. All plants actively improve and/or maintain their property/asset protection (against fire, flood, wind and earthquake losses to their property) to protect the company from loss, focusing capital dollars on the plants with the highest impact. This helps to address potential physical risk associated with extreme weather due to climate change.

To address transition risk, we monitor current and emerging regulations around carbon pricing schemes, such as the EU Emissions Trading System(ETS), to understand how this could impact our owned manufacturing facilities. We forecast site emissions through

estimated future emissions based on the previous year, production during the new year, and site-specific trends. Our teams seek to introduce emissions reducing practices, such as renewable energy and energy efficiency projects at facilities covered under the EU ETS to reduce the number of required allowances and to reduce our emissions overall. For example, in 2020 one of our facilities in Ireland changed from heavy fuel oil to liquified natural gas in an effort to reduce emissions and allowances required for the facility.

C2.2a

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

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	We monitor current regulations and compliance with them as they directly and indirectly relate to climate risks. This is done at multiple levels, within a business unit and within the legal function. Identified risks are elevated within management appropriately and are part of our enterprise risk management (ERM) process. Examples would include regulation on carbon pricing or emissions trading.
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	We monitor emerging regulations as they directly and indirectly relate to climate risks. This is done at multiple levels, within a business unit and within the legal function. Identified risks are elevated within management appropriately and are part of our ERM process. Examples would include regulation on carbon pricing or emissions trading.
Technology	Relevant, sometimes included	As opportunities arise, we review new technologies that may reduce our CO2 emissions and energy use to meet our corporate sustainability goals. An example is the use of satellite monitoring of deforestation in our cocoa and palm supply chains.
Legal	Relevant, always included	We address legal compliance risk in our risk assessment. For example, in our 2020 10-K Annual Report (at page 20 of the document), we state: “Concern about climate change might result in new legal and regulatory requirements to reduce or mitigate the effects of climate change. These changes could increase our operating costs for things like energy or packaging through taxes or regulations, including payments under extended producer responsibility policies.” .
Market	Relevant, always included	We address market issues through a variety of ways, including through our sustainable agriculture programs, direct sourcing criteria, and commodity hedging. Risks considered include: environmental risks or controversies across our supply chain that could damage our reputation and brand image, such as deforestation in the palm oil

		sector. We manage it by our raw material sourcing programs.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	We consider reputational risks associated with climate change during our ERM process. These risks are managed, ultimately, by the Governance Committee, which receives regular updates from our Chief Well-being, Sustainability, Public and Government Affairs Officer. Risks considered include: environmental risks or controversies across our supply chain that could damage our reputation and brand image, such as deforestation in the palm oil sector. We manage it by our raw material sourcing programs. We acknowledge the reputational risks related to environmental risk in our Form 10-K filed in 2020 (e.g., page 11-12 – reputation and brand image).
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	As acknowledged in our Form 10-K, we have identified the risk that severe weather may cause unanticipated business disruptions. At the asset level, we do business continuity planning for a variety of business matters. We have a business plan to react to disruptions caused by a given crisis, including potential facility interruptions. At the corporate level, we manage global reputational risks related to issues raised by continuity planning. An example would be the impact of hurricanes or severe storms on factory and distribution operations.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	As acknowledged in our Form 10-K , we have identified the risk that severe weather and climate change-related events can affect commodity pricing and supply. At the asset level, we do business continuity planning for a variety of business matters. We have a business plan to react to disruptions caused by a given crisis, including key sourcing interruptions. At the corporate level, we manage global reputational risks related to issues raised by continuity planning and raw material sourcing programs. An example would be the impact of climate change on the availability of raw materials such as cocoa sourced from climate-sensitive regions.

C2.3

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

Yes

C2.3a

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

Identifier

Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation

Carbon pricing mechanisms

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

Increased cost to generate and purchase energy due to fuel/energy taxes and regulations.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

100,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

We are directly impacted by fuel taxes for energy we buy in our direct operations, which contributes to our Scope 1 and 2 carbon footprint. In addition, we would be indirectly impacted by energy and carbon taxes applied elsewhere in our supply chain by increased costs from suppliers. Analysis of likely carbon pricing scenarios indicates a potential annual impact of $100 million on energy costs in our operations, assuming no change in the energy efficiency or proportion of renewable energy consumed. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

Cost of response to risk

40,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

Our sustainability strategy and our targets to reduce energy consumption and CO2 emission in our operations constitute a concrete approach to mitigating these risks by

anticipating regulatory requirements. This includes improving energy management systems and investing in energy efficient technologies in our factories at an estimated capital cost of $40 million over the period 2018-2025. In 2020, we succeeded in improving our overall energy efficiency by 9% over the 2013 baseline, leading to a total 117,000 tons reduction in CO_2 emissions in our manufacturing plants . We are also using low-carbon renewable energy sources to reduce our CO_2 emissions and anticipate this to be cost-neutral.

Comment

In disclosing these risks in C2.3a, we are not specifying that they are among the highest climate-related substantive risks or that the disclosed risks are the only substantive climate-related risks.

Climate change is a real risk to our consumers, our business, our economy, and the planet at large. That's why we have set science-based targets to reduce our carbon footprint across our value chain – from farms growing our ingredients to the packaging around our products. We have set a target to reduce absolute end-to-end greenhouse gas emissions by 10% by 2025, compared to a 2018 baseline. This is in line with reductions in emissions necessary to keep global warming well below 2 degrees Celsius, as defined by the Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) guidelines and in line with the Paris Agreement, and an important milestone in our work towards creating a sustainable future for snacking.

Identifier

Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical

Changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns

Primary potential financial impact

Increased direct costs

Company-specific description

As stated in our 2020 10-K Annual Report at page 20 of the document: "Scientific evidence collected by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change demonstrates that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere have caused and will in the future cause changes in weather patterns around the globe. These changes are expected to increase the frequency of extreme weather events and natural disasters and affect water availability and quality. These impacts increase risks for the global food production and distribution system. Decreased agricultural productivity caused by climate change might limit the availability of the commodities we purchase and use. These include cocoa, which is a critical raw material for our chocolate and biscuit

portfolios that is particularly sensitive to changes in climate, as well as other raw materials such as wheat, vegetable oils, sugar, nuts and dairy."

As stated in our annual report, a number of external factors such as changing weather patterns and conditions, commodity market conditions, currency fluctuations and the effects of governmental agricultural or other programs affect the cost and availability of raw materials and agricultural materials used in our products. We address higher commodity costs and currency impacts primarily through hedging, higher pricing and manufacturing and overhead cost control. We use hedging techniques to limit the impact of fluctuations in the cost of our principal raw materials; however, we may not be able to fully hedge against commodity cost changes, and our hedging strategies may not protect us from increases in specific raw material costs. We continue to monitor the long-term impacts of climate change and related factors that could affect the availability or cost of raw materials, packaging and energy. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

100,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

As stated in our 10-K, while we have not experienced this yet, based on realistic swings in commodity costs of some of our raw materials considered most vulnerable to climate change, we estimate a high potential impact on our cost of goods in an extreme scenario, such as prolonged adverse weather conditions affecting multiple production regions. We consider this extreme scenario to be unlikely so we have based our estimate on the potential impact of one or more significant commodities being impacted in the longer term (more than 6 years), which we consider more likely than not. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

Cost of response to risk

60,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

Transforming our agricultural supply chains is an essential foundation for a sustainable future. We've launched innovative, industry-leading holistic programs in key commodities like cocoa and wheat. Cocoa Life a multi-year investment to empower more than 200,000 farmers and improve the lives of more than 1 million people. Harmony, our European wheat program, promotes biodiversity and good environmental practices in wheat production Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers' accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies. Our cost of management is calculated according to our annual investment in our sustainable sourcing raw material programs in the of $60 million.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Downstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Market

Other, please specify

Changing consumer behavior

Primary potential financial impact

Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

Company-specific description

As stated in our 10-K Annual Report we have identified shifting consumer preferences as a strategic and operational risk. "Negative perceptions concerning the health, environmental and social implications of certain food products, ingredients, packaging materials, sourcing or production methods could influence consumer preferences and acceptance of some of our products and marketing programs." We also stated on page 20 of the document: "Concern about climate change might cause consumer preferences to switch away from products or ingredients considered to have high climate change impact. . . . Finally, the fact that consumers are exposed to rising temperatures could affect demand for our products, such as decreased demand we have experienced for chocolate during periods when temperatures are warmer." In 2020 we identified increasing awareness of consumers of packaging-related climate impacts in key markets as a risk.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

50,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

As indicated in our 2020 10-K Annual Report (at page 16 of the document), maintaining focus on sustainable ingredient sourcing and sustainable packaging to address evolving consumer preferences is important to our growth, and failure to satisfy consumer preferences could materially and adversely affect our reputation, brands, product sales, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. A potential financial impact from this risk would come from a decrease in revenue due to a decline in our chocolate and biscuit categories where we know through consumer insights that sustainable ingredients and packaging are top sustainability concerns. This is a broad estimate and is not considered a forecast.

Cost of response to risk

90,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

Transforming our agricultural supply chains is an essential foundation for a sustainable future. We've launched innovative, industry-leading holistic programs in key commodities like cocoa and wheat. Cocoa Life a multi-year investment to empower more than 200,000 farmers and improve the lives of more than 1 million people. Harmony, our European wheat program, promotes biodiversity and good environmental practices in wheat production. Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers' accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies.

We are on a sustainable packaging journey to make all packaging recyclable by 2025, have 5% recycled content in our plastic packaging by 2025 and include recycling labeling on all packs by 2025. The challenge around plastics involves process, policy and perception. We take a holistic approach to sustainable packaging by also focusing on improvements in infrastructure and technology to collect and recycle plastics. The

company currently invests over $30 million a year in technology, resources and recycling infrastructure and anticipates an acceleration in this investment over time. In total, between 2019 and 2025, Mondelēz International anticipates spending approximately $300 million in creating a sustainable future for plastics.
Our cost of management is calculated according to our annual investment in our sustainable sourcing raw material and sustainable packaging efforts of approximately $90 million.

Comment

C2.4

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

Yes

C2.4a

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

Identifier

Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Upstream

Opportunity type

Resilience

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Other, please specify

Increased reliability, climate- resilience of raw material supply chain

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced direct costs

Company-specific description

In ingredient sourcing, we continue to leverage our global operating scale to secure sustainable raw materials and work with suppliers to drive meaningful social and environmental changes, focusing where we can make the greatest impact. For example, we launched our Cocoa Life program in 2012 and are investing up to $400 million through 2022 to build a sustainable cocoa supply. We are also improving sustainability in our wheat supply by working with farmers in North America and through our Harmony program in Europe. Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers' accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party supplies.

By implementing these sustainable agriculture programs, we help our supply chains to mitigate their emissions and to become more resilient to the effects of climate change, leading to more stable and secure supplies of key raw materials. For example, we source the majority of our cocoa from West Africa, where there is significant opportunity to improve farmers' productivity and climate change resilience via our Cocoa Life program. In addition, we encourage more sustainable and climate resilient production of wheat through our Harmony and North American wheat sustainability programs and palm oil through our Palm Oil Action Plan.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

High

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

No, we do not have this figure

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

We anticipate that more sustainable and climate-resilient supplies of key raw materials will increase the security of supply and help to reduce exposure to fluctuations in availability and price volatility. The potential financial impact of this opportunity could not be estimated at this time.

Cost to realize opportunity

60,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Transforming our agricultural supply chains is an essential foundation for a sustainable future. We've launched innovative, industry-leading holistic programs in key commodities like cocoa and wheat. Cocoa Life a multi-year investment to empower more than 200,000 farmers and improve the lives of more than 1 million people. Harmony, our European wheat program, promotes biodiversity and good environmental practices in wheat production Our palm oil action plan sets out milestones to increase suppliers' accountability for sustainability across their own operations and third-party

supplies. Our cost of management is calculated according to our annual investment in our sustainable sourcing raw material programs in the of $60 million.

Comment

In disclosing these opportunities in C2.4a, we are not specifying that they are among the highest climate-related substantive opportunities or that the disclosed opportunities are the only substantive climate-related opportunities.

Identifier

Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

We use significant energy in our factories to manufacture our products. Increased energy efficiency in our factories enables us to use less energy and therefore save costs per ton of production.

For example, in our factories across the world we have opportunities to install energy efficient capital equipment for manufacturing processes such as ovens, steam production and refrigeration. Energy management systems enable us to track and monitor energy use and focus efforts to reduce consumption. In 2020, we significantly increased our use of renewable energy, from 8% to 23% of total energy used. This increase played a key part in enabling us to achieve a big reduction in CO_2 emissions – by 147,109 tons, from 1,336,793 tons in 2019 to 1,189,684 tons in 2020.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

25,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

Our sustainability strategy and our targets to reduce energy consumption include improving energy management systems and investing in energy efficient technologies in our factories result in cost efficiencies from lower energy consumption. We estimate savings of approximately $25 million over the period from 2018-2025. This is a broad estimate and not considered a forecast.

Cost to realize opportunity

40,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Our sustainability strategy and our targets to reduce energy consumption and CO2 emission in our operations constitute a concrete approach to mitigating these risks by anticipating regulatory requirements. This includes improving energy management systems and investing in energy-efficient technologies in our factories at an estimated capital cost of $40 million over the period 2018-2025. In 2020, we succeeded in improving our overall energy efficiency by 9%, from our 2013 baseline, leading to a total 117,000 tons reduction in CO_2 emissions in our manufacturing plants since the baseline year.

Comment

Identifier

Opp3

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Energy source

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced direct costs

Company-specific description

We use renewable energy in our factories through installation of on-site renewable energy at various facilities, and by power purchase agreements in Mexico, Brazil, Lithuania, Greece, India, Thailand, Italy and the US (from 2020), with other opportunities under investigation. Investing in renewable energy provides opportunities to help us reduce emissions and costs and grow our business in future.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

40,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

We estimate that purchasing renewable electricity supplies in our factories will lead to a potential annual benefit in our operations of approximately $40 million from avoided carbon pricing by 2025, based on the proportion of our total energy consumption that is likely to come from low-carbon renewable sources. This is a broad estimate and not considered a forecast.

Cost to realize opportunity

0

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

We are also using low-carbon renewable energy sources to reduce our CO_2 emissions and anticipate this to be cost-neutral as a result of renewable energy sources becoming cost competitive vs traditional fossil fuel sources in a number of markets.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your organization's strategy and/or financial planning?

Yes, and we have developed a low-carbon transition plan

C3.1a

(C3.1a) Is your organization's low-carbon transition plan a scheduled resolution item at Annual General Meetings (AGMs)?

	Is your low-carbon transition plan a scheduled resolution item at AGMs?	Comment
Row 1	No, and we do not intend it to become a scheduled resolution item within the next two years	Our Climate roadmap is a centerpiece of our annual Snacking Made Right report. This report is published around the same time of year as the Annual Shareholder meeting (ASM), where we speak about the work at a high level. In parallel to the ASM, we host dedicated investor sessions on ESG, where we go into more specific details on our climate work.

C3.2

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

Yes, qualitative and quantitative

C3.2a

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

Climate-related scenarios and models applied	Details
2DS Other, please specify See Details for descriptions.	Every year, Mondelēz International works with external climate experts to conduct a comprehensive analysis of our environmental footprint, including carbon, water and land impacts across our entire value chain. This work provides us with direction for where to prioritize our efforts and develop emissions reductions targets focusing on carbon hotspots. In 2020 we used forward-looking scenario analysis to inform our updated climate strategy that aligns Mondelēz International with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Paris Agreement to keep global

	warming below 2ºC relative to pre-industrial levels. We chose the 2ºC scenario in anticipation of setting and validating reduction targets through the Science Based Target Initiative. This analysis covered our business end-to-end, including emissions from land-use change in our agricultural commodity supply chain. Based on the 2ºC scenario analysis, Mondelēz International adopted science-based targets to reduce absolute end-to-end CO2 emissions by 10% vs 2018 baseline (goal validated 2019, announced Feb 2020), with a Well-Below 2ºC commitment on our Scope 1&2. In addition to supporting our SBTi goal setting, results of our scenario analysis guide our business strategy and objectives around carbon, outlined in our 2025 carbon roadmap. The roadmap includes a plan for capital expenditures over a medium-term horizon (1-6 years) to help us achieve our 2025 public commitments while also initiating planning for the longer-term horizon. The strategy prioritizes hotspots within our value chain including our manufacturing and raw material footprint. This roadmap will be executed across the business, and our global value chain, via a network of Mondelēz International leaders focused on evolving their business practices to contribute toward our 2025 target. For example, we identified renewable energy in owned operations as an area of focus and have signed several large renewable energy contracts in key manufacturing regions in recent years. In 2020, our Australia team announced it will be switching to 100% renewable electricity for two Melbourne factories that make some of Australia's favourite Cadbury, The Natural Confectionery Company and Pascall treats. In our upstream value chain, we increased our commitments to address deforestation in key agricultural commodities, which we know to be the largest contributor to our footprint based on the insight from our lifecycle assessment. Since we announced our commitment to combat deforestation in cocoa at the 2015 COP21 summit, we have been a driving force in the creation and ongoing work of the Cocoa Forest Initiative, a public private partnership between the cocoa industry and the governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana, , joined the Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action as co-chair, and worked closely with suppliers on protecting and restoring forest via our signature Cocoa Life program publishing our own Climate Report for the past two years outlining our progress against our climate strategy. As of 2020, our Palm Action Plan, requires traceable, forest-monitored palm oil from mills across our supply chain. The new requirements include traceability to plantation and satellite monitoring covering all palm oil concessions supplying mills attributed to the company, against the deforestation criteria set out in its Palm Oil Action Plan.

C3.3

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

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence
Products and services	Yes	We understand our consumers are increasingly concerned about the environmental degradation caused by a growing global population, from the impacts of deforestation to plastic pollution in our oceans. In our annual report we flag this as a risk and identify the need to correctly predict, identify and interpret how these changes in consumer preferences and demand will impact the products they buy. We are responding to this risk by evolving our portfolio to offer new and improved products that meet these changing needs now, and as well as thinking about longer-term innovations to prepare for the future of snacking. Our consumers shouldn't have to worry about the impact their snacking choices have on the planet. We want them to be confident that when they choose our brands, they are choosing snacks made the right way. Our sustainable sourcing programs are helping us deliver snacks made the right way over the next 5 years. By 2025, 100% of our cocoa volume for chocolate brands will be sourced through Cocoa Life. In Europe, all EU biscuits will be made with sustainably sourced wheat from our Harmony program by 2022. By informing our consumers about our commitment to sustainable sourcing through on-pack communication we can address consumers concerns around the impact their snack has on the environment and leverage this as an opportunity to gain trust and love for our brands. An example of how this comes to life in our brands and products is the launch in 2020, of NoCoe, Mondelēz International's first carbon neutral snack. NoCOe was launched through SnackFutures, our innovation and investment vehicle that capitalizes on emerging trends in snacking. By design, this cracker is a low carbon product from its locally sourced, organic ingredients to the

		manufacturing and production processes used to deliver the cracker to consumers. Additionally, through our sustainable packaging efforts, we are working toward zero packaging waste and a circular pack economy. By 2025, we aim to have all product packaging be 100% recycle-ready.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	Emissions from our supply chain contribute the greatest share of emissions to our end-to-end carbon footprint, with raw material production accounting for around 70%. Resilience of our agricultural commodity supply is a major climate-related risk for a global snacking company like Mondelēz International. Specifically, impacts of extreme weather, deforestation, depleting freshwater resources and related commodity price increases are of concern within the short and long-term. In response to these risks, we continue to evolve and develop our signature sustainable agriculture programs as they are key in helping reduce our footprint, achieve our science-based target of 10% absolute reduction of emissions end-to-end by 2025 and secure a resilient raw material supply chain. Through our Palm Oil Action Plan, Cocoa Life and Harmony Wheat programs we incentivize farmers and raw material traders to reduce the environmental impact of commodity production through climate change preparedness practices such as agroforestry, fertilizer and pesticide management, and water stewardship. In our Cocoa Life program, we train farmers on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Good Environmental Practices (GEP) that help increase their productivity while farming in more environmentally responsible ways. This helps us to achieve our strategy to help farmers grow more cocoa on less land, which improves their incomes and reduces the incentive to expand production into forested areas.
Investment in R&D	Yes	In 2020, we saw more movement across the globe on climate-related regulations as part of broader climate action plans. For example, multiple states in the United States have introduced extended producer responsibility (EPR) mandates shifting the financial burden of product end of life

		disposal back to the producer. The evolving regulatory landscape presents a risk for Mondelēz International. Mondelēz International is well prepared to respond to these risks as our sustainability and R&D teams have been working on packaging innovation efforts that strive toward a zero-packaging waste + circular pack economy. Our teams are redesigning our snack packages to reduce material and increase recyclability. Months ahead of schedule, we achieved our 2020 goal of taking action to reduce packaging materials by 65,000 tons since 2012. Year-on-year, we reduced packaging by 4,100 tons. Our actual reduction over these 8 years was over 68,000 tons. By 2025, 100% of our packaging will be designed for recyclability. Also, we set a virgin plastic reduction target for 2025 that will result in a 5% absolute reduction in virgin plastic use in overall plastic packaging relative to 2020, including a 25% cut in virgin plastic in its rigid plastic packaging. These actions are expected to result in a 10,000-ton reduction of virgin plastic packaging in five years.
Operations	Yes	There are numerous climate-related risks that could directly impact our owned operations, including regulatory changes in carbon pricing, severe weather and depleting water resources interrupting operations. Our manufacturing teams play a huge part in our 2025 carbon roadmap to achieve our 10% absolute reduction goal. To deliver our targets to reduce emissions from operations, we plan capital expenditures over a medium-term horizon (1-6 years) to support investments to improve energy management systems and install energy-efficient technologies in our factories. These investments help us reduce exposure to increased energy costs from carbon pricing and to benefit from opportunities to reduce costs through more efficient manufacturing processes. In Europe, energy efficiency and renewable energy projects in our operations help us to reduce the annual allowances required by the ETS scheme. Large contracts for renewable energy in key regions have helped us to reduce our energy-related emissions by 24% exceeding our 2020 target. We recognize opportunities to reduce operations costs by using energy more efficiently and increasing the proportion of energy we buy from low-carbon renewable sources.

C3.4

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

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	Direct costs Capital expenditures	Our 2025 sustainability plans, including our climate plan, are supported by an enterprise-wide roadmap, which allocates KPIs and associated investment requirements to each of our geographic business units. The roadmap covers each year until 2025 and ensures that we have financial control of our sustainable agriculture, end-to-end environmental impact, packaging and social sustainability programs. It addresses all elements of our climate change risks and opportunities. Capital expenditures are planned by function and business unit over the medium term (1-6 years) to account for incremental investments and resource needed to achieve our targets. Climate related risks and opportunities influence our finance plans that are presented to the Board as part of the enterprise-wide sustainability plan.

C3.4a

(C3.4a) Provide any additional information on how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy and financial planning (optional).

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

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

Absolute target

C4.1a

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

Target reference number

Abs 1

Year target was set

2020

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

Scope 1+2 (location-based) +3 (upstream & downstream)

Base year

2018

Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)

18,903,340

Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

80

Target year

2025

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

10

Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]

17,013,006

Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

Target status in reporting year

New

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

Well-below 2°C aligned

Please explain (including target coverage)

Note: In 2020, MDLZ recalculated our 2018 baseline figures due to data improvements, emissions factor updates and methodological updates. The recalculated 2018 baseline, increased the original 2018 baseline by <1%, well below the SBTi 5% threshold that requires notification of the change. This will enable Mondelēz International to more accurately and consistently track progress against our targets in years to come. Due to this recalculation of our base year emissions in 2020, we have not begun reporting against our 2025 target.

As stated on the SBTi website, in January 2020 we set our SBTi target to reduce absolute scope 1, 2, and 3 (purchased goods and services and waste generated in operations) GHG emissions 10% by 2025 from a 2018 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to Well-below 2°C
Purchased goods and services represent on their own 81% of our scope 3 emissions, therefore together with waste generation in operations, our scope 3 targets cover above the 2/3 threshold required by the SBTi criteria. Purchased goods and services figures includes emissions from land use change as detailed in section 6.5 that details our methodology for calculating scope 3 emissions.

Target reference number

Abs 2

Year target was set

2015

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

Scope 1+2 (market-based)

Base year

2013

Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)

1,566,367

Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

90

Target year

2020

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

15

Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]

1,331,411.95

Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1,189,684

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

160.3213040111

Target status in reporting year

Achieved

Is this a science-based target?

Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but it has not been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative

Target ambition

Other, please specify

Please explain (including target coverage)

In 2015, we established new 2020 sustainability goals that placed us at the forefront of the fight against climate change and support our 2020 ambition to be the leader in well-being snacks while driving down costs and creating efficiencies to accelerate our growth. We used the science-based targets methodology to set absolute CO2 from energy emissions reduction goals from manufacturing by 15% from base year 2013 as part of our ambitious end-to-end approach. We consulted with the science-based target setting organizations at the time and supported the We Mean Business coalition in 2015. However, this goal is not validated by the current SBT Initiative and does not cover Scope 3 emissions. In our Snaking Made Right 2020 Progress Report, we report our 2020 CO2 reduction goal as "exceeded" as we reduced carbon emissions from manufacturing by 24%.

C4.2

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

Other climate-related target(s)

C4.2b

(C4.2b) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Target reference number

Oth 1

Year target was set

2015

Target coverage

Company-wide

Target type: absolute or intensity

Absolute

Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

Other, please specify

% reduction in waste generated in manufacturing

Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Base year

2013

Figure or percentage in base year

412,536

Target year

2020

Figure or percentage in target year

335,000

Figure or percentage in reporting year

284,553

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

165.0626805613

Target status in reporting year

Achieved

Is this target part of an emissions target?

No

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Other, please specify

Consumer Goods Forum

Please explain (including target coverage)

Units are metric tonnes. In 2015, we established new 2020 sustainability goals. By 2020, we will reduce total manufacturing waste by 20%, focusing on total waste and not just non-beneficial waste. Our waste volumes are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

We have exceeded our goal to reduce total waste by 20% by 2020, compared to 2013. We achieved 31% reduction versus baseline compared to 20% reduction target.

C4.3

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

Yes

C4.3a

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	29	7,198
To be implemented*	0	0
Implementation commenced*	116	13,288
Implemented*	78	144,045
Not to be implemented	0	0

C4.3b

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

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

32

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

60,170

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

50

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Combined heat and power (cogeneration)

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

260

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

0

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

0

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

6-10 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Compressed air

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

226

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

78,068

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

170,000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

229

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

29,396

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

49,908

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

6-10 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Waste heat recovery

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

2,561

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
2,169,225

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
816,468

Payback period
<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
6-10 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type
Energy efficiency in buildings
Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
1,640

Scope(s)
Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
712,350

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
2,638,559

Payback period
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
6-10 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Insulation

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

380

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

35,528

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

702

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

161,158

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

356,653

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

6-10 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

588

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

197,845

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

456,709

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Other, please specify

Maintenance Program

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

95

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
17,668

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
131

Payback period
<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
3-5 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type
Energy efficiency in production processes
Motors and drives

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
902

Scope(s)
Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
93,961

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
116,569

Payback period
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
11-15 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
709

Scope(s)
Scope 1
Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
1,720,979

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
584,108

Payback period
<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
3-5 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type
Low-carbon energy generation
Solar heating and cooling

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
25

Scope(s)
Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
331

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
714

Payback period
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

Solar PV

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

843

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

35,116

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

10,000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

Low-carbon electricity mix

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

108,492

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

1,337,287

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Summary of the renewable energy initiatives across Asian, Latin American, and North American sites.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity

Waste reduction

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

26,365

Scope(s)

Scope 3

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

11,200,000

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Monetary saving number as reported in Snacking Made Right page 38. We believe the best way to tackle waste is to not generate it in the first place. To this end, we set bold goals, developed robust plans and executed the waste reduction agenda with strong governance and discipline. We applied different technologies and approaches to reduce waste, for example, using high-speed cameras to analyze processes, improving inspections and maintenance to reduce line stoppages, and developing more efficient

changeover processes. And we continue to design processes and lines to minimize waste generation in the first place. As a result of our focused and transformational approach, our manufacturing sites achieved very strong results in waste in the 2013-2020 cycle: 31% reduction versus 20% reduction goal in absolute terms, despite production volume growth. This achievement is the result of the zero losses and 100% engagement approach taken in our supply chain, in which every single colleague is responsible for the identification and eradication of losses.

C4.3c

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

Method	Comment
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	At production facility level. Examples: EU Emission Trading Scheme (see relevant section of CDP); European IPPC legislation; UK Climate legislation
Employee engagement	Some examples: Earth Week initiatives, Environmental Month (with safety and health), environmental volunteering initiatives, Green Teams, carpool networks, incentives for biking and running to work, parking spots dedicated for hybrid vehicles. Our employee communications and engagement programs at all of our manufacturing and office sites worldwide includes energy/CO2 awareness activities.
Dedicated budget for energy efficiency	Dedicated budget for energy efficiency, renewable energy projects, and other emissions reduction activities in our operations enables us to meet our publicly available science-based CO2 reduction goal. In 2020, we invested over 5 million Dollars in energy efficiency projects and low-Carbon installations.
Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities	Dedicated budget for renewable energy projects and other emissions reduction activities in our operations enables us to meet our publicly available science-based CO2 reduction goal. In Australia, we have signed a ten-year agreement to source 100% renewable electricity for our Victorian manufacturing sites, reducing our Australia and New Zealand carbon emissions by 50% – 34,217 tons over 10 years (after verification).

C4.5

(C4.5) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products or do they enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions?

Yes

C4.5a

(C4.5a) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products or that enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions.

Level of aggregation

Company-wide

Description of product/Group of products

Packaging reduction was a key 2020 target for Mondelēz International. In 2020, we achieved ten months ahead of schedule our 2020 goal of taking action to reduce packaging materials by 65,000 tons since 2012. Year on year, we reduced packaging by 4,100 tons. Our actual reduction over these 8 years was over 68,000 tons. Overall, these changes have resulted in emissions avoidance because of the materials used and more efficient transportation.

Are these low-carbon product(s) or do they enable avoided emissions?

Avoided emissions

Taxonomy, project or methodology used to classify product(s) as low-carbon or to calculate avoided emissions

Other, please specify

Packaging reduction efforts across our entire product portfolio help us to avoid emissions.

% revenue from low carbon product(s) in the reporting year

Comment

In 2020 we set 2025 public commitments in packaging:
•100% packaging designed to be recyclable and labeled with recycling information
• 5% reduction in overall virgin plastic
• 25% reduction in virgin rigid plastic

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

(C5.1) Provide your base year and base year emissions (Scopes 1 and 2).

Scope 1

Base year start

January 1, 2018

Base year end

December 31, 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

883,722

Comment

The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 - 39.) Our Scope 1 emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2018

Base year end

December 31, 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

960,405

Comment

The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and also prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 - 39.) Our Scope 2 location-based emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2018

Base year end

December 31, 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

959,819

Comment

The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and also prior years. (See The

Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 - 39.) Our Scope 2 market-based emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

C5.2

(C5.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Fugitive Emissions from Refrigeration, Air Conditioning, Fire Suppression, and Industrial Gases
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Indirect Emissions From Purchased Electricity
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion Sources
US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources
Other, please specify
US EPA Climate Leaders: Design Principles US EPA GHG Reporting Regulations: 40 CFR 98.

C5.2a

(C5.2a) Provide details of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

The environmental reporting requirement is to remove all data from divestitures and add data from acquisitions for the year of acquisition and also prior years. (See The Greenhouse Gas Protocol, section Tracking Emissions Over Time, pages 34 – 39.) Our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are recalculated annually and adjusted, if necessary, to incorporate changes in quantification methodologies, significant data corrections, and corporate structural changes, including acquisitions or divestitures.

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

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

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

852,548

Comment

Global scope 1 emissions remained flat comparting to previous year.

C6.2

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

Row 1

Scope 2, location-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

Scope 2, market-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

Comment

C6.3

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

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based

760,947

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)

674,770

Comment

Our scope 2 market-based emissions reduced by 26% due to implementation of several renewable energy agreement, as part of our journey to decarbonize our internal manufacturing operations.

C6.4

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

Yes

C6.4a

(C6.4a) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

Source

Executive transportation

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source (if applicable)

Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded

Deemed out of scope for Mondelēz International this year. These emissions were calculated for the previous reporting cycle and are insignificant, around 0.01% from total Mondelez emissions.

Source

Leased product warehouses

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source (if applicable)

Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded

Some leased product warehouses are operationally controlled but not included. GHG emissions based on available data have been determined to be insignificant (much less than 1%) compared to available data from our other product warehouses.

Source

Leased Sales Cars

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source (if applicable)

Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded

Some sales cars are operationally controlled but not included. GHG emissions are insignificant (much less than 1%) compared to owned sales fleet.

C6.5

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

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

18,744,950

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Category 1- Purchased goods and services- includes all upstream emissions from the production of the goods and services purchased. This includes impacts associated with all raw ingredients (commodity and non-commodity) as well as packaging. Agricultural raw materials are the main source of CO2 scope 3 emissions, with packaging production contributing an important, but clearly secondary, source of emissions. Our most prominent commodities are: cocoa, wheat, dairy, sugar, palm oil. The supply chain was characterized based on the total mass of purchases of nearly 100 food input material categories and eight packaging material categories. For each of these material categories, information on the life cycle GHG emissions was taken from a variety of sources, Ecoinvent database, scientific literature and other available data. In cases where data for the exact commodity or category could not be found, the most suitable proxy available was selected to avoid large gaps. Emissions are determined as the mass purchased multiplied by these factors of GHG emissions per weight. For packaging materials, processing to produce a finished package has been assumed based on emissions information from the Ecoinvent database. In the case of agricultural commodities that require additional processing beyond the level of their representation in the database, insufficient information is available to represent such processes, except in the case that it takes place in one of our facilities.

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

0

Please explain

Note: In 2020, MDLZ recalculated our 2018 baseline figures due to data improvements, emissions factor updates and methodological updates. This will enable Mondelez to more accurately and consistently track progress against our targets in years to come. The recalculated 2018 baseline changed the original 2018 baseline by <1%. Scope 3 2019 numbers were updated according to this new methodology resulting in a higher footprint than was reported in 2019 CDP, resulting in a lower year over year change.

Capital goods

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Historically, Mondelēz International performed qualitative investigations and concluded that this scope 3 category was not relevant comparing to our total scope 3 emissions.

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

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

878,704

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Emissions from all direct uses of energy have been calculated based on amounts of electricity and fuel used throughout the company and applying cradle-to-gate emission factors from the Ecoinvent database, consistent with the methodology used throughout the Scope 3 calculations described here. From this result, the Scope 2 emissions, described above, were subtracted.

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

0

Please explain

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

2,060,253

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Data excludes warehouses. We use third-party transportation companies (common carriers) to transport raw materials to manufacturing facilities. The primary GHG emission source from common carriers is CO2 from diesel fuel combustion. Transportation CO2 emissions for production materials were estimated based on a number of simplifying assumptions: average distance (e.g., source country to country of use), common modes of transport, average fuel efficiency, assumed shipment weights,

etc. The calculation is based on the multiplication of life cycle emissions information for the relevant modes of transport (in units of emission per tkm) derived from the Ecoinvent database.
Some emissions resulting from distribution of sold product were recategorized as Category 4, due to Mondelez being the entity financially responsible for that transport.

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

0

Please explain

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

57,676

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Emissions from landfill, incineration and recycling of operation waste, inbound packaging, etc. were considered in the calculation. Emission factors coming from the EcoInvent 3.3 database, calculated using the Impact 2002+ method, were used.

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

0

Please explain

There was an overall YOY decrease, due to a decrease in mass going to waste treatment.

Business travel

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

6,575

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard.

Employee air, car, and rail business travel emissions were estimated using spend data and EIO-LCA emission model. The source of the latest emission factors is taken from

Carnegie Mellon University Green Design Institute. (2019) Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA) US 2007. Some Economic Input-Output data sourced from 2002 source (hotel stays, which was newly included this year), due to data limitations. All quantities calculated to adjust for inflation between data year and reporting year.

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

0

Please explain

Employee commuting

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

146,793

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard.

Emissions estimated based on publicly-available regional car and public transit commute data. Assumed 26.81 mile distance round trip (for all modes), 240 days per year. Emission factors from EcoInvent 3.3 database, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ method, were used.

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

0

Please explain

There was an overall YOY decrease, due to a methodology change that refined mode assumptions and COVID-related impact.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Despite the existence of some leasing activities in Mondelēz International, leasing assets is not part of our core business. Emissions from leased assets were qualitatively evaluated and considered irrelevant as they were not material enough to evaluate.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

100,499

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. This year, because Mondelēz International is financially responsible for product transport to retail, the emissions of distribution of sold product has been recategorized to Category 4.

Emissions also include those resulting from retail storage. Production volumes (minus an assume distribution loss) and product categories inform the extent to which refrigeration is required at retail, ultimately resulting in a calculation of energy required to refrigerate relevant products at stores. This energy quantity is mapped to an electricity consumption emission factor from the Ecoinvent database.

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

0

Please explain

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

As a snack company, the vast majority of our products is sold for direct consumption, without any additional industrial processing. Therefore, emissions due to processing sold products are deemed irrelevant as they are not material enough to evaluate.

Use of sold products

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

59,203

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard.

The emissions reported here reflect a rough prediction of the emissions from the use of

products. The end-of-life of the food products themselves is not included. The emissions during the use of products include refrigeration for dairy, egg based products and cheeses. Assumptions have been made based on the proportion of the total of our products sold that are likely to undergo each use. For simplicity, it has currently been assumed that all use activities are fueled by electricity. Approximations are then made of the amount of electricity use required per kilogram of product. These approximations are made based on preliminary estimates of typical consumer behaviors and are generic among product categories. The total amount of electricity use is then estimated based on emissions factors taken from the Ecoinvent database for several countries or an adapted dataset from IEA electricity statistics.

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

0

Please explain

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e

1,029,495

Emissions calculation methodology

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The end-of-life of packaging is determined based on the amount of various categories of packaging material that have been purchased in the relevant time period (with the assumption that this is also representative of the amount of packaging disposed in the same period). The proportions of various fates (landfilling, recycling and incineration) of each material have been determined by information available for several countries, which has then been applied as an approximation of disposal routes within each of the five global sales regions. Emissions information is taken from the Ecoinvent database to determine the amount of GHG emissions occurring during the landfilling, recycling and incineration of any given material. Generally, a "cut-off" approach was taken to end of life allocation. This means that in the case of recycling, full burden is applied at the input, but emissions and credits associated with end of life treatment are excluded from the scope.

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

0

Please explain

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

In Mondelēz International operations there are a few, very limited instances where we are asset lessors, as this activity is not part of our core business. We qualitatively evaluated emissions from this category and considered them irrelevant.

Franchises

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Mondelēz International is a snacking company that sells directly, mostly to retailers and distributors. Franchises are not applicable to Mondelez business model.

Investments

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Historically, Mondelēz International performed qualitative investigations and concluded that this scope 3 category was not relevant comparing to our total scope 3 emissions.

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

The majority of our upstream emissions have been reported in other categories.

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

The majority of our downstream emissions have been reported in other categories.

C-AC6.6/C-FB6.6/C-PF6.6

(C-AC6.6/C-FB6.6/C-PF6.6) Can you break down your Scope 3 emissions by relevant business activity area?

Yes

C-AC6.6a/C-FB6.6a/C-PF6.6a

(C-AC6.6a/C-FB6.6a/C-PF6.6a) Disclose your Scope 3 emissions for each of your relevant business activity areas.

Activity

Agriculture/Forestry

Scope 3 category

Purchased goods and services

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18,744,950

Please explain

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Category 1- Purchased goods and services- includes all upstream emissions from the production of the goods and services purchased.. This includes impacts associated with all raw ingredients (commodity and non-commodity) as well as packaging. Agricultural raw materials are the main source of CO2 scope 3 emissions, with packaging production contributing an important, but clearly secondary, source of emissions. Our most prominent commodities are: cocoa, wheat, dairy, sugar, palm oil. The supply chain was characterized based on the total mass of purchases of nearly 100 food input material categories and eight packaging material categories. For each of these material categories, information on the life cycle GHG emissions was taken from a variety of sources, including the most prominent Ecoinvent database, scientific literature and other available data. In cases where data for the exact commodity or category could not be found, the most suitable proxy available was selected to avoid large gaps. Emissions are determined as the mass purchased multiplied by these factors of GHG emissions per weight. For packaging materials, processing to produce a finished package has been assumed based on emissions information from the Ecoinvent database. In the case of agricultural commodities that require additional processing beyond the level of their representation in the database, insufficient information is available to represent such processes, except in the case that it takes place in one of our facilities.

Activity

Consumption

Scope 3 category

Use of sold products

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

59,203

Please explain

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The emissions reported here reflect a rough prediction of the emissions from the use of products. The end-of-life of the food products themselves is not included. The emissions during the use of products include refrigeration for dairy, egg based products and cheeses. Assumptions have been made based on the proportion of the total of our products sold that are likely to undergo each use. For simplicity, it has currently been assumed that all use activities are fueled by electricity. Approximations are then made of the amount of electricity use required per kilogram of product. These approximations are made based on preliminary estimates of typical consumer behaviors and are generic among product categories. The total amount of electricity use is then estimated based on emissions factors taken from the Ecoinvent database for several countries or an adapted dataset from IEA electricity statistics.

Activity

Consumption

Scope 3 category

End of life treatment of sold products

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,029,495

Please explain

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The end-of-life of packaging is determined based on the amount of various categories of packaging material that have been purchased in the relevant time period (with the assumption that this is also representative of the amount of packaging disposed in the same period). The proportions of various fates (landfilling, recycling and incineration) of each material have been determined by information available for several countries, which has then been applied as an approximation of disposal routes within each of the five global sales regions. Emissions information is taken from the Ecoinvent database to determine the amount of GHG emissions occurring during the landfilling, recycling and incineration of any given material. Generally, a "cut-off" approach was taken to end of life allocation. This means that in the case of recycling, full burden is applied at the input, but emissions and credits associated with end of life treatment are excluded from the scope.

Activity

Distribution

Scope 3 category

Downstream transportation and distribution

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100,499

Please explain

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. This year, because Mondelēz International is financially responsible for product transport to retail, the emissions of distribution of sold product has been recategorized to Category 4.

Emissions also include those resulting from retail storage. Production volumes (minus an assume distribution loss) and product categories inform the extent to which refrigeration is required at retail, ultimately resulting in a calculation of energy required to refrigerate relevant products at stores. This energy quantity is mapped to an electricity consumption emission factor from the Ecoinvent database.

Activity

Distribution

Scope 3 category

Upstream transportation and distribution

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2,060,253

Please explain

Scope 3 emissions are calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Data excludes warehouses. We use third-party transportation companies (common carriers) to transport raw materials to manufacturing facilities. The primary GHG emission source from common carriers is CO2 from diesel fuel combustion. Transportation CO2 emissions for production materials were estimated based on a number of simplifying assumptions: average distance (e.g., source country to country of use), common modes of transport, average fuel efficiency, assumed shipment weights, etc. The calculation is based on the multiplication of life cycle emissions information for the relevant modes of transport (in units of emission per tkm) derived from the Ecoinvent database.

This year, some emissions resulting from distribution of sold product were recategorized as Category 4, due to Mondelēz International being the entity financially responsible for that transport.

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

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

Yes

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

(C-AC6.8a/C-FB6.8a/C-PF6.8a) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

Emissions (metric tons CO2)

19,049

Methodology

Default emissions factors

Please explain

Calculations were made using default emission factors for biogenic fuels as provided by DEFRA.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

Methodology

Other, please specify

We don't have information regarding emissions from biofuel combustion in transportation.

Please explain

From the methodology used to calculate transportation emissions it is not possible to estimate biogenic emissions from biofuels.

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

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

Agricultural commodities

Wheat

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions for our key commodities as part of our annual corporate footprinting exercise. Commodity data provided as metric tons of commodity per business region and business unit, broken down by sourcing region. Line items were mapped to emission factors from the WFLDB 3.4 or Ecoinvent 3.3, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ (vQ2.29) (March 2019) impact assessment method. EFs were supplied for climate change impacts with and without LUC. For commodites, where possible -- the Dryad LUC tool was used to develop a custom country-specific LUC (Dryad is a tool developed by Quantis in compliance with the Quantis NCS Guidance). Dryad allows for increased transparency on drivers of LUC impacts (vegetation loss, peatland drainage, soil erosion, etc.). The tool, however, is dependent on data availability from the FAO -- therefore it does not cover all commodities and sourcing regions (ex. dairy commodities are currently not covered by Dryad). When Dryad LUC EF values are unavailable, the default Blonk tool built into WFLDB 3.4 and ecoinvent 3.3 datasets was used. While the Blonk tool LUC values lack transparency, they are widely used and generally accepted to be credible.

Agricultural commodities

Sugar

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions for our key commodities as part of our annual corporate footprinting exercise. Commodity data provided as metric tons of commodity per business region and business unit, broken down by sourcing region. Line items were mapped to emission factors from the WFLDB 3.4 or Ecoinvent 3.3, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ (vQ2.29) (March 2019) impact assessment method. EFs were supplied for climate change impacts with and without LUC. For commodites, where possible -- the Dryad LUC tool was used to develop a custom country-specific LUC (Dryad is a tool developed by Quantis in compliance with the Quantis NCS Guidance). Dryad allows for increased transparency on drivers of LUC impacts (vegetation loss, peatland drainage, soil erosion, etc.). The tool, however, is dependent on data availability from the FAO -- therefore it does not cover all commodities and sourcing regions (ex. dairy commodities are currently not covered by Dryad). When Dryad LUC EF values are unavailable, the default Blonk tool built into WFLDB 3.4 and ecoinvent 3.3 datasets was used. While the Blonk tool LUC values lack transparency, they are widely used and generally accepted to be credible.

Agricultural commodities

Other

Cocoa and cocoa co-products

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

No

Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions for our key commodities as part of our annual corporate footprinting exercise. Commodity data provided as metric tons of commodity per business region and business unit, broken down by sourcing region. Line items were mapped to emission factors from the WFLDB 3.4 or Ecoinvent 3.3, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ (vQ2.29) (March 2019) impact assessment method. EFs were supplied for climate change impacts with and without LUC. For commodites, where possible -- the Dryad LUC tool was used to develop a custom country-specific LUC (Dryad is a tool developed by Quantis in compliance with the Quantis NCS Guidance). Dryad allows for increased transparency on drivers of LUC impacts (vegetation loss, peatland drainage, soil erosion, etc.). The tool, however, is dependent on data availability from the FAO -- therefore it does not cover all commodities and sourcing regions (ex. dairy commodities are currently not covered by Dryad). When Dryad LUC EF values are unavailable, the default Blonk tool built into WFLDB 3.4 and ecoinvent 3.3 datasets was used. While the Blonk tool LUC values lack transparency, they are widely used and generally accepted to be credible.

Agricultural commodities

Other

Dairy

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions for our key commodities as part of our annual corporate footprinting exercise. Commodity data provided as metric tons of commodity per business region and business unit, broken down by sourcing region. Line items were mapped to emission factors from the WFLDB 3.4 or Ecoinvent 3.3, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ (vQ2.29) (March 2019) impact assessment method. EFs were supplied for climate change impacts with and without LUC. For commodites, where possible -- the Dryad LUC tool was used to develop a custom country-specific LUC (Dryad is a tool developed by Quantis in compliance with the Quantis NCS Guidance). Dryad allows for increased transparency on drivers of LUC impacts (vegetation loss, peatland drainage, soil erosion, etc.). The tool, however, is dependent on data availability from the FAO -- therefore it does not cover all commodities and sourcing regions (ex. dairy commodities are currently not covered by Dryad). When Dryad LUC EF values are unavailable, the default Blonk tool built into WFLDB 3.4 and ecoinvent 3.3 datasets was used. While the Blonk tool LUC values lack transparency, they are widely used and generally accepted to be credible.

Agricultural commodities

Palm Oil

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

We calculate GHG emissions for our key commodities as part of our annual corporate footprinting exercise. Commodity data provided as metric tons of commodity per business region and business unit, broken down by sourcing region. Line items were mapped to emission factors from the WFLDB 3.4 or Ecoinvent 3.3, calculated using the IMPACT 2002+ (vQ2.29) (March 2019) impact assessment method. EFs were supplied for climate change impacts with and without LUC. For commodites, where possible -- the Dryad LUC tool was used to develop a custom country-specific LUC (Dryad is a tool developed by Quantis in compliance with the Quantis NCS Guidance). Dryad allows for increased transparency on drivers of LUC impacts (vegetation loss, peatland drainage, soil erosion, etc.). The tool, however, is dependent on data availability from the FAO -- therefore it does not cover all commodities and sourcing regions (ex. dairy commodities are currently not covered by Dryad). When Dryad LUC EF values are unavailable, the default Blonk tool built into WFLDB 3.4 and ecoinvent 3.3 datasets was used. While the Blonk tool LUC values lack transparency, they are widely used and generally accepted to be credible.

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

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

Palm Oil

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

536,289

Change from last reporting year

About the same

Please explain

Small year to year changes are tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020. Improved methodology used in the 2020 re-baseline corrected 2019 palm oil emissions data to 525,735.

Sugar

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

710,351

Change from last reporting year

About the same

Please explain

Small year to year changes are tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020.

Wheat

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,943,862

Change from last reporting year

Higher

Please explain

Observed year to year changes are directly tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020.

Other

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12,707,247

Change from last reporting year

About the same

Please explain

Other includes Cocoa and cocoa products (7,495,962 metric tonnes CO2e) and Dairy (5,211,285 metric tonnes CO2e).
Small increases in year over year emissions from Cocoa are due to the use of updated Land Use Change emissions factors for key sourcing regions causing the carbon footprint to increase overall. Improved methodology used in the 2020 re-baseline corrected 2019 Cocoa emissions data to 7,294,257. Note: These corrected 2019 numbers were not verified by SGS and are therefore directional only.

Small year to year changes in Dairy are directly tied to increases in quantity purchased in FY2020.

C6.10

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

Intensity figure

0.0000590382

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

1,527,318

Metric denominator

unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total

25,870,000,000

Scope 2 figure used

Market-based

% change from previous year

13.9

Direction of change

Decreased

Reason for change

Our scopes 1 and 2 emissions reduced 13% versus previous year, driven by scope 2 emissions reduction due to the implementation of several renewable energy initiatives during the year 2020. Savings from these projects are better explained in section 8. Energy efficiency projects also generated a reduction, even though less impactful, as presented in section 4.3.

Intensity figure

17.79614176

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

1,527,318

Metric denominator

full time equivalent (FTE) employee

Metric denominator: Unit total

85,823

Scope 2 figure used

Market-based

% change from previous year

19.95

Direction of change

Decreased

Reason for change

Our scopes 1 and 2 emissions reduced 13% versus previous year, driven by scope 2 emissions reduction due to the implementation of several renewable energy initiatives during the year 2020. Savings from these projects are better explained in section 8. Energy efficiency projects also generated a reduction, even though less impactful, as presented in section 4.3. Our number of employees increased from 80,000 in 2019 to 85,823 this year, also contributing to the reduction of this intensity figure by 19%.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

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

Yes

C7.1a

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
Other, please specify CO2e	852,548	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

C7.2

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
North America	276,619
Europe	310,095
Latin America (LATAM)	94,175

Asia, Australasia, Middle East and Africa	171,659

C7.3

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

By activity

C7.3c

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Manufacturing	733,609
Private Fleet	72,476
Sales fleet	46,464

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

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

Yes

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

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

Activity

Processing/Manufacturing

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

733,608.53

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

Scope 1 manufacturing includes fuel combustion and fugitive emissions at manufacturing sites.

Activity

Distribution

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

118,939.64

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

Scope 1 emissions reported here for distribution include impacts from private fleet and sales fleet.

C7.5

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in Scope 2 market-based approach (MWh)
North America	189,786	95,601	500,767	217,576
Europe	256,487	265,417	853,001	22,634
Latin America (LATAM)	34,135	33,316	274,333	145,182
Asia, Australasia, Middle East and Africa	280,539	280,437	579,261	57,008

C7.6

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

By activity

C7.6c

(C7.6c) 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)
Manufacturing	656,528	574,833
Non-manufacturing	104,419	99,937

C7.9

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

Decreased

C7.9a

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

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption	108,492	Decreased	6.15	Many renewable energy projects reached Commercial Operation during 2020. The most impactful was the VPPA in the USA, that delivered alone 85,000 Tons of CO2e reduction. Other large sites like Puebla in Mexico and VSA in Brazil also started running on renewable electricity. Several other on-site solar installations started operating in 2020, for example, in China, Spain, France and Italy. Total reduction due to RE, 108,492 CO2e Tons represents 6.15% of the gross scopes 1 and 2 emissions in 2019, 1,762,939 Tons. Expectation is to continue this positive trend on RE, as more projects will go live in 2021.
Other emissions reduction activities	9,188	Decreased	0.52	We estimate that energy efficiency projects delivered 9,188 CO2e Tons in 2020, considering the projects that were concluded during the year. Total reduction due to energy efficiency represents 0.52% of the gross scopes 1 and 2 emissions in 2019, 1,762,939 Tons. The trend for 2021 is to increase the amount of energy reduced, as the pandemic, hopefully, wanes.
Divestment				
Acquisitions				

Mergers				
Change in output				
Change in methodology	85,157	Decreased	4.83	Until 2019, emissions from electricity in offices and warehouses were calculated using an estimation based on the number of headcounts. Starting in 2020, we included square footage of the facilities in the data collection from these sites and the estimation of electricity consumed became much more accurate, generating a reduction. Expectation for 2021 is to continue reducing electricity consumption in non-manufacturing sites, as COVID19 still limits gathering and travel.
Change in boundary				
Change in physical operating conditions	11,034	Decreased	0.63	We decreased the amount of miles run by our owned sales fleet, which generated a 11,034 CO2e Tons during 2020. We expect to increase miles run by sales fleet in 2021, as the pandemic wanes.
Unidentified				
Other	21,750	Decreased	1.23	We estimated that the updated scope 2 CO2e conversion factors generated a reduction of approximately 21.750 CO2e Tons, which represents 1,23% of 2019 gross scopes 1 and 2 emissions, 1,762,939 CO2e Ton. Most of the countries where we operated improved their Carbon emission factors without action from our side. In parallel, we have improved our data collection of CO2 factors from suppliers, which improves our accuracy of the actual emissions and also reduces our Carbon emissions.

C7.9b

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

Market-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

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

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

C8.2

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

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

C8.2a

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

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	LHV (lower heating value)	54,342	2,987,509	3,041,851
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity		442,400	1,670,295	2,112,695
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat		6,274	3,927	10,201
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam		16,604	67,860	84,464
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy		5,741		5,741
Total energy consumption		525,361	4,763,954	5,289,315

C8.2b

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

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

C8.2c

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

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Biodiesel

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1,159.47

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

1,159.47

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

5.008

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020

Comment

Biodiesel used as fuel for generator in one of our sites in India.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Bagasse

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

17,679

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

17,679

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

4.2917

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020 - Using wood pallets as reference.

Comment

Bagasse used in Mondelez sites to produce steam.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Butane

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

6,254

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

5,629

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

625

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

61.6307

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (US EPA 2020).

Comment

We consume butane as fuel at only one location, the estimated usage is 10% for steam and 90% for ovens

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Coal

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

6,424

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

6,424

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

93.6833

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020 - coal (industrial)

Comment

We have one boiler in the whole supply chain that consumes coal, in an area with very limited fuels available. The site is in process to replace this boiler for another that also consumes biomass, so that we can start consuming responsibly sourced biomass progressively, until availability is sufficient to eliminate the usage of coal.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Heavy Gas Oil

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

14,919

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

14,919

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

79.1222

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020 - Fuel Oil

Comment

We don't have details on the usage of heavy oil per site. We estimate that the majority of it is used as fuel for emergency electricity generators.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Light Distillate

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

29,687

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

29,687

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

75.8611

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020 - Gas Oil

Comment

We don't have detailed information on the consumption of light distillate per site. We estimate it is mostly used to generate electricity.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

36,123

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

36,123

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

63.9722

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020

Comment

We don't have details on the usage of LPG per site but we estimate the majority of it is used to generate heat.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Natural Gas

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

2,874,194

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1,350,871

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

1,523,322

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

56.5944

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020

Comment

We estimated that 47% of our natural gas is used in ovens and the rest is used in boilers.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Propane Gas

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

19,908

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

19,908

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

58.4934

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (US EPA 2020)

Comment

We dont have details on the usage of Propane gas in our operations, but we estimated the majority of it is used to generate heat.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Rapeseed Oil

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

841

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

841

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

5.008

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020 - Biodiesel

Comment

We use rapeseed oil at our manufacturing site in Sweden, in a boiler.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Wood

Heating value

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

34,363

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

17,181.56

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

17,181.56

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

4.2917

Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

Emissions factor source

DEFRA 2020 - wood pellets

Comment

We don't have details on the usage of wood per site but we estimate half of it is used to generate steam and the other half for heat.

C8.2d

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

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	68,917	68,917	5,741	5,741
Heat	1,431,178	1,431,178	18,023	1,413,156
Steam	1,564,608	1,564,608	34,861	1,529,747
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2e

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

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Geothermal

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Italy

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

6,026

Comment

Geothermal energy purchased at the Caramagna site, in Italy.

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Geothermal

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Philippines

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

5,631

Comment

Geothermal electricity puchased at the Sucat site, in the Philippines.

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Hydropower

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
India

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
4,111

Comment
Hydropower purchased for the Malanpur plant, in India

Sourcing method
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Solar

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
India

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
3,294

Comment
Solar electricity purchased for Malanpur plant, in India

Sourcing method
Standard product offering by an energy supplier supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Solar

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
United States of America

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
618

Comment
Electricity from solar supplied by local utilities in Portland, United States.

Sourcing method
Standard product offering by an energy supplier supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
United States of America

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
618

Comment
Electricity from wind supplied by local utilities in Portland, United States.

Sourcing method
Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
South Africa

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
11,078

Comment
Electricity from wind bought during winter months in Port Elizabeth, South Africa

---

Sourcing method
Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator without energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type
Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
Mexico

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor
39,706

Comment
Electricity from wind purchased through a PPA in Mexico, for Ecatepec and Puebla sites.

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Wind

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Greece

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

6,431

Comment

Wind energy purchased with certificated for our operation in Athens, Greece.

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Low-carbon energy mix

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Lithuania

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

10,163

Comment

100% Renewable energy contract with local utility supplier backed up by certificates for our site in Kaunas, Lithuania.

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, not supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Hydropower

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

India

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

32,876

Comment

Hydropower electricity supplied to our facility in Baddi, India.

Sourcing method

Power purchase agreement (PPA) with on-site/off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line)

Low-carbon technology type

Biomass

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Thailand

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

18

Comment

Renewable electricity from sugarcane bagasse provided by a local sugar supplier.

Sourcing method

Green electricity products (e.g. green tariffs) from an energy supplier, supported by energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Nuclear

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Switzerland

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

14

Comment

Electricity from nuclear supplied to our site in Bern, Switzerland.

Sourcing method

Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator without energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Biomass

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Brazil

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

104,690

Comment

Renewable electricity generated from sugarcane bagasse for our two sites in Brasil.

Sourcing method

Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator without energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Hydropower

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

Peru

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

786

Comment

Electricity from a hydropower plant in Peru supplied to our site in Lima.

Sourcing method

Other, please specify

Virtual Power Purchase Agreement

Low-carbon technology type

Solar

Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling

United States of America

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

216,340

Comment

Renewable energy certificates from a solar plant in the United States, obtained through a 12 year Virtual Power Purchase Agreement.

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

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

C10. Verification

C10.1

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

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

C10.1a

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

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Reasonable assurance

Attach the statement

Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

Page/ section reference

pp 1-3

Relevant standard

ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.1b

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

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Reasonable assurance

Attach the statement

Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

Page/ section reference

pp 1-3

Relevant standard

ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 market-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Reasonable assurance

Attach the statement

Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

Page/ section reference

pp 1-3

Relevant standard

ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.1c

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

Scope 3 category

Scope 3 (upstream & downstream)

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

Mondelez - GHG Verification Statement 2020 v1.1.pdf

Page/section reference

pp 1-3

Relevant standard

ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.2

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

No, we do not verify any other climate-related information reported in our CDP disclosure

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

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

Yes

C11.1a

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

EU ETS

C11.1b

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

EU ETS

% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

4.8

% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

Period start date

January 1, 2020

Period end date

December 31, 2020

Allowances allocated

40,909

Allowances purchased

6,300

Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

40,909

Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

Details of ownership

Facilities we own and operate

Comment

At the start of 2020, Mondelēz International had over 39,000 allowances on account. In order to cover the difference of what needed to be surrendered for 2020, Mondelēz International purchased 6,300 allowances. This purchase included extra EUAs in the case that a transfer of EUAs between facilities did not happen in time for surrendering.

C11.1d

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

Mondelēz International records and tracks the allowances given to each of concerned European facilities each year. We forecast site emissions through estimated future emissions based on the previous year, production during the new year and site-specific trends. This allows us to ensure we have enough allowances for each facility as well as giving time to prepare for any shortfall in allowances.

Our teams are constantly looking to introduce emissions reducing practices, such as renewable energy and energy efficiency projects, at facilities covered under the EU ETS, in order to reduce the number of required allowances. For example, in 2020 one of our facilities in Ireland changed from heavy fuel oil to Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) in an effort to reduce emissions and allowances required for the facility.

C11.2

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

No

C11.3

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

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

C12. Engagement

C12.1

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

Yes, our suppliers

C12.1a

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

Type of engagement

Engagement & incentivization (changing supplier behavior)

Details of engagement

Run an engagement campaign to educate suppliers about climate change
Offer financial incentives for suppliers who reduce your upstream emissions (Scopes 3)

% of suppliers by number

68

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

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

27

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Our goal is that by 2025, we will source 100% of the cocoa volume for our chocolate brands through Cocoa Life. At the end of 2020, we reached 188,043 farmers in 2,169 communities. Cocoa Life works in six key origins (ordered by program size and priority): Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire, Indonesia, India, Brazil, Dominican Republic.

Through Cocoa Life, we incentivize farmers to participate in programs aimed at improving the sustainability of smallholder businesses, to protect and restore forests, and to empower local communities. Participating farmers can freely participate in all offered program activities and receive resources such as trees and planting material through the program. In addition, Cocoa Life offers a financial incentive in the form of a price premium to participating farmers.

We invest in practices and resources to improve farmer productivity on existing land to promote forest conservation. As of 2020, we have trained 246,262 community members and farmers as of 2020 on good environmental practices through the Cocoa Life program.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

In May 2021, we published Cocoa Life's 2020 Annual Report as part of our Snacking Made Right 2020 Progress Report. The report shows that engaging suppliers in the Cocoa Life program is having a positive impact: • Cocoa yields are continuously improving, and results show that as cocoa farms become more efficient, their yield increases. This is an important development, as farms that can do more with less land are able to create spare land that can be used for other income-generating activities, helping make cocoa farming a prosperous business. • More communities are steering their own development and Cocoa Life communities can become drivers of change. Through the use of planning and advocacy tools, these communities have been able to attract the funding and resources needed to develop — an important step because sector change will only be sustained if local actors feel empowered to do so. • Farmers are choosing not to expand into protected forests and encouraging and enabling cocoa farmers and communities to protect the land where cocoa is grown has been fundamental to the Cocoa Life approach. Mapping efforts and tools support farmers in understanding how to get more out of their farms – helping them build better businesses. Since 2016, we have promoted a coordinated strategy and supply chain transparency by openly publishing our farm mapping updates online. This marked the first time a large cocoa sourcing company had disclosed locations of the cocoa farms they source from. We partner with Global Forest Watch to implement satellite image mapping practices to analyze how Cocoa Life farms interact with forested and protected land. This allows us to intervene if farmers expand into protected areas. Our interactive online map provides public traceability of locations of Cocoa Life farms and supports farmers in improving yields. To date, 71% (167,795) of Cocoa Life registered farms,

spanning over 258,177 ha, have been mapped. These efforts can reduce deforestation, reducing climate change impacts.

Comment

In partnership with the United Nations Development Programme, as of 2020 we distributed 2,186,243 economic shade trees on cocoa farms in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire and Indonesia to restore forest lands and make farmer cocoa yields more productive. Cocoa Life efforts are also aimed at helping farmers become more resilient to climate change. Our climate change strategy addresses deforestation in our raw material supply chain, with a particular focus on cocoa and palm oil. Cocoa Life is an integrated cocoa sourcing strategy, addressing farming, community, livelihoods, youth and environment. As part of Cocoa Life's climate change strategy, we have REDD+ partnerships with the governments of Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana, focused on addressing deforestation in cocoa producing areas. Cocoa Life helps to transform markets by connecting consumers with cocoa origin communities through the use of an on-pack logo on selected brands, including Cadbury Dairy Milk, Cote d'Or and Marabou. In addition to Cocoa Life, we helped instigate the sector-wide Cocoa and Forest Initiative, working with cocoa and chocolate companies, the governments of Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana and international partners.

Note: Volume was used as a proxy for # of suppliers in calculating % suppliers above and therefore the % provided indicates the share of annual Cocoa volume coming from suppliers in direct engagement with the Cocoa Life program in 2020.
The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

Type of engagement

Compliance & onboarding

Details of engagement

Included climate change in supplier selection / management mechanism
Code of conduct featuring climate change KPIs
Climate change is integrated into supplier evaluation processes

% of suppliers by number

100

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

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

3

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

The % of suppliers by number noted above represents the proportion of our palm oil supply covered by our Palm Oil Action Plan. Our goal is for 100% of our palm oil to be traceable to the mill from suppliers with aligned policies by 2025.

We expect our suppliers to adhere to MDLZ palm oil sourcing principles at the parent group level within their own company, as well as oversight of their suppliers' adherence to these principles at parent group level. In addition to suppliers' published policies, we also expect suppliers to demonstrate implementation, progress vis-a-vis the most updated version of our Palm Oil Action Plan. This is a prerequisite of doing business with us.

We evaluate their performance against it annually. We call out our suppliers to act faster to eliminate deforestation and to map and monitor all palm oil plantations and concessions. Specifically, we have asked our suppliers to commit to palm oil concession mapping as a vital step to accountability and change.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

In 2020, 100% of our palm oil supply was RSPO certified, 98% was traceable to the mill and 99% from suppliers with policies aligned to Palm Action Plan. RSPO efforts directly relate to reducing climate impacts by working to eliminate deforestation.

If a supplier fails to meet the terms of our action plan, we start by working with them to fix the problem. But when there is a significant breach of our principles, we exclude suppliers until the breach is addressed. We investigate claims against our suppliers and take action against verified deforestation allegations and any producers shown to be part of groups we've previously excluded. These cases highlight the urgent need for sector-wide monitoring to provide one source of verified data about deforestation by palm oil plantation companies. Our current engagement via the CGF-FPC towards creating minimum criteria for monitoring and development of monitoring and response framework is in line with our philosophy of tackling issues via common aligned sector wide approach and act collectively with the force for good.

From 2020, we require traceable, forest-monitored palm oil from mills across our supply chain. The new requirements include traceability to plantation and satellite monitoring covering all palm oil concessions supplying mills attributed to the company, against the deforestation criteria set out in its Palm Oil Action Plan. All mills must be identified on Global Forest Watch, with no active grievances against concessions in their direct supply or operated by the same producer groups elsewhere. In addition, suppliers must have third-party assurance of their monitoring process and systems used and be subject to cross-check by Mondelēz International.

As of 2020, we excluded 98 concessions or mills linked to upstream suppliers that were found to be involved in deforestation, because we believe urgent action is needed across the entire supply chain to protect the Earth's forests and deliver benefits to countries that produce palm oil.

Comment

Volume was used as a proxy for # of suppliers in calculating % suppliers above and therefore the percentage provided indicates the share of annual palm volume coming from suppliers in direct engagement with our sustainable palm program in 2020.

Note:
The % supplier indicates % of our total palm suppliers directly engaged in this supplier engagement activity.
The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

Type of engagement

Engagement & incentivization (changing supplier behavior)

Details of engagement

Run an engagement campaign to educate suppliers about climate change

% of suppliers by number

24

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

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

2

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

In 2007, our leading biscuit brand in France, LU, decided to source wheat grown in a better way and so Harmony was born. Today, our Harmony program has grown into an industry-leading and well-respected program for sustainable farming. More than 1,500 farmers across Europe have joined the initiative and 100 percent of the wheat supply to our French bakeries comes from the Harmony fields. Through Harmony, we work with farmers across Europe to grow wheat in a way that helps conserve water, cares for the soil, protects and promotes biodiversity, and reduces carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter.

In addition to our work in Europe, since 2015, we've partnered with Michigan State University (MSU) and our supplier of soft white wheat, Cooperative Elevator Company (Coop), a 100+ year old cooperative. In partnership with MSU and Coop, we engage a group of about 100 family farmers each year to track their farming practices, use of inputs such as fertilizer, and their yield. The group anonymously tracks their own year-on-year performance, as well as their performance versus peers. Growers in this program collaborate and learn from each other, to produce the highest quality Triscuit wheat while considering the ecological footprint.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

The Harmony Wheat program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields. Each year, the Harmony Charter is reviewed

and updated as part of our continuous improvement approach. In 2016, we began an ambitious monitoring system to measure and assess the environmental and economic impact of Harmony practices. Working in partnership with SMAG, a software solutions provider for the agricultural sector, and Agrosolutions, we've developed an automated reporting approach to calculate and monitor 12 key economic and environmental indicators on Harmony farms. The results will be used to inform continuous improvement with farmers and to advocate for the continued shift toward sustainable wheat.

In 2018, MSU analyzed data over three years of the program and determined that farmers who used advanced agronomy practices improved their yields between 1.5 and 4 bushels per acre more than those who didn't. Growers in this program collaborate and learn from each other, to produce the highest quality Triscuit wheat while considering the ecological footprint. As they enjoy a higher yield than peers outside the program, MSU and Coop's agronomy team are working to make the learnings more widely accessible to all 1,100 Coop growers.

Comment

Note: Volume was used as a proxy for # of suppliers in calculating % suppliers above and therefore the percentage provided indicates the share of annual wheat volume coming from suppliers in direct engagement with our sustainable wheat programs in 2020. The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

Type of engagement

Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

Details of engagement

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

% of suppliers by number

51

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

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

4

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Since 2013, Mondelēz International committed to reduce by 2020 65,000 tons of packaging material by optimizing our packaging formats, while also minimizing food waste. In order to achieve our targets, a packaging optimization program was established with half of our global packaging supply base and actioned through our legal agreements where suppliers commit to generate optimization/reduction ideas which are

jointly reviewed and tracked with pre-defined annual targets. The optimization program to encourages innovation and reduce packaging products and services.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

In 2020 Mondelēz International exceeded the packaging reduction goal eliminating a total of 68,000 tons since 2013.

Our packaging optimization program has been deployed across 51% of our suppliers tackling 81% of our total global spend. This program has been driven through our commercial agreements with specific clauses where supplier agrees that optimization ideas are an important component of a successful customer-supplier relationship, therefore they commit to provide innovative ideas to look for end-to-end opportunities to drive the most optimized specifications for each of the packaging components they supply to us. Dedicated supplier resources are agreed to manage this platform and the optimization manager/team is responsible to build, present, and track a strong pipeline to ensure pre-defined annual targets are met. All ideas proposed from suppliers require joint approval and possible joint implementation by both Mondelēz International and Supplier. Once a project is approved, both companies will dedicate the required resources to implement the project. In this way the project pipeline is jointly guaranteed throughout the term of the agreement.

Comment

Note:

The % of suppliers by number indicate percentage of total packaging suppliers who are engaged in this packaging optimization program.

The % supplier-related scope 3 emissions is based on metric tons CO2e emissions disclosed in C6.5.

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

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

Yes

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

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

Management practice reference number

MP1

Management practice

Agroforestry

Description of management practice

Introduction of shade trees and agroforestry practices on cocoa farms to reduce emissions and increase productivity and climate change resilience.

Your role in the implementation

Financial
Knowledge sharing
Operational
Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

As of 2020, our Cocoa Life program, in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme, distributed 2,186,243 economic shade trees on cocoa farms in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire and Indonesia to restore forest lands and make farmer cocoa yields more productive.

In addition, we invest in agroforestry research, development and implementation as part of the solution and have identified a knowledge gap on the topic as it relates to the financial impact for smallholders. This is why we are running trials and research with farms to introduce agroforestry at different levels of tree density and introduced an incentive model to promote agroforestry practices. Our Payments for Environmental Services (PES) pilot programs incentivize farmers and communities to protect forests and adopt forest-friendly farming techniques such as planting complementary crops alongside cocoa.

Climate change related benefit

Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

Comment

Guided by the measurable key indicator results reported in our Cocoa Life 2020 Annual Report, our Cocoa Life program will refine its focus to key areas of intervention where we can make the biggest impact, including combating deforestation through both conservation and restoration cocoa farming practices. Achieving zero deforestation globally requires public-private partnerships. Cocoa origin governments must have the right policies and commitments in place and align on agroforestry principles. We will continue to publicly report our impact results and encourage more industry members to implement integrated and holistic approaches to broaden the collective impact at scale.

Management practice reference number

MP2

Management practice

Biodiversity considerations

Description of management practice

Farmers in our Harmony program implement the following actions for biodiversity:
• At least 3% of every Harmony wheat field dedicated to flowers or hedges
• Inter-season crops
• Actions to sensitize farmers to the issue of biodiversity
• Responsible use of pesticides

Your role in the implementation

Knowledge sharing
Operational
Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Through Harmony, we work with farmers across Europe to grow wheat in a way that helps conserve water, cares for the soil, protects and promotes biodiversity, and reduces carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter. As a result, the program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields.

Climate change related benefit

Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

Comment

At the end of 2020, 76 percent of our biscuits across the EU were made with Harmony wheat, including brands such as LU, Oro, LiGA, and Fontaneda. While we've made solid progress so far, we know there is still more to be done. Our ambition is to source 100 percent of our wheat need in the EU by 2022. To date, more than 1,600 farmers have joined the program. In 2020, 215,330 tons of wheat flour was produced by our 17 millers and 26 cooperatives.

Management practice reference number

MP3

Management practice

Fertilizer management

Description of management practice

Farmers in our Harmony program grow wheat in a sustainable way to prevent the usage of pesticides and fertilizers, preserve water and soil reduce carbon emissions, through:
• Rigorous Selection of seeds for the resilience and quality of our biscuits
• Crop rotation to minimize treatment

• Principled use of water and reasoned treatment at the last resort

In North America, our wheat farmers are adopting innovative practices to optimize pesticide and fertilizer use, growing all of the wheat we need for our Triscuit brand, with a lower environmental footprint.

Your role in the implementation

Knowledge sharing
Operational
Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Through Harmony, we work with farmers across Europe to grow wheat in a way that helps conserve water, cares for the soil, protects and promotes biodiversity, and reduces carbon emissions. We also engage with governments and NGOs throughout the process, and 10 percent of farmers are audited each year by an independent organization to ensure compliance with the Harmony Charter. As a result, the program has led to a 20 percent reduction in pesticide use, and nearly 10 million bees and more than 25 species of butterflies have been observed in flowers sown around the Harmony fields.

Since 2015, we've partnered with Michigan State University (MSU) and our supplier of soft white wheat, Cooperative Elevator Company (Coop), a 100+ year-old cooperative. In partnership with MSU and Coop, we engage a group of about 100 family farmers each year to track their farming practices, use of inputs such as fertilizer, and their yield. The group anonymously tracks their own year-on-year performance, as well as their performance versus peers.

Climate change related benefit

Emissions reductions (mitigation)

Comment

At the end of 2020, 76 percent of our biscuits across the EU were made with Harmony wheat, including brands such as LU, Oro, LiGA, and Fontaneda. While we've made solid progress so far, we know there is still more to be done. Our ambition is to source 100 percent of our wheat need in the EU by 2022. To date, more than 1,600 farmers have joined the program. In 2020, 215,330 tons of wheat flour was produced by our 17 millers and 26 cooperatives.

In 2018, MSU analyzed data over three years of the program and determined that farmers who used advanced agronomy practices improved their yields between 1.5 and 4 bushels per acre more than those who didn't. Growers in this program collaborate and learn from each other, to produce the highest quality Triscuit wheat while considering the ecological footprint. As they enjoy a higher yield than peers outside the program, MSU and Coop's agronomy team are working to make the learnings more widely

accessible to all 1,100 Coop growers.

Management practice reference number

MP4

Management practice

Governmental or institutional policies and programs

Description of management practice

Programs to address deforestation risks linked to key supply chains, cocoa and palm oil, by engaging in sector-wide action coordinated with governments in key producing countries: Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana (cocoa) and Indonesia (palm oil).

Your role in the implementation

Financial
Knowledge sharing
Operational

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

In 2015, Mondelēz International was the first company to raise the issue of deforestation in the cocoa industry at the COP21 summit in Paris and the first chocolate maker to sign Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with the governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire. We are a founding member of the Cocoa and Forests Initiative (CFI), a collaboration among the governments of Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana – the world's two largest cocoa producers – as well as 30 cocoa and chocolate companies and other partners, is committed to ending deforestation, restoring forested areas and eliminating illegal cocoa production. Our action plans align to the CFI's three focus areas of Forest Protection & Restoration, Sustainable Production & Farmers' Livelihoods and Social Inclusion & Community Engagement, and feature the following commitments:

• We are one of the first chocolate companies to commit to map 100% of the farms in our Cocoa Life program in key origins to ensure that farmers are not operating in forested land. We've already mapped 71% of these farms covering 258,177 ha, using Global Forest Watch to assess the risk of tree loss.
• We're the first organization to introduce incentives in the form of Payment for Environmental Services (PES) agreements to a cocoa-farming context, encouraging farmers to protect and restore forests. We aim to have agreements with 33,000 farmers by 2022.
• We know that deforestation can't be addressed through cocoa farmers alone, so we involve the whole community. By 2022, nearly 1,300 cocoa communities will have active forest restoration and protection programs through Cocoa Life.

In palm , we worked with the Government of Indonesia and other partners to develop the Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (SPO) Initiative to help strengthen smallholder farmers, support national policy reform and reduce deforestation through public-private

partnerships. This led to the publication in 2017 of Indonesia's first-ever National Action Plan (NAP) for sustainable palm oil, which provides a national framework for reform. We also helped Conservation International and other partners to create the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods, an initiative focused on collective action to drive economic development, reduce poverty and improve natural resource management in the Indonesian provinces of North Sumatra and Aceh. The project supports the aims of the NAP.

Climate change related benefit

Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

Comment

For palm oil: We also helped Conservation International and other partners to create the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods, an initiative focused on collective action to drive economic development, reduce poverty and improve natural resource management in the Indonesian provinces of North Sumatra and Aceh. The project supports the aims of the NAP.

Management practice reference number

MP5

Management practice

Land use change

Description of management practice

Programs to address deforestation in key supply chains--cocoa and palm oil--by engaging suppliers (traders) and producers.

Your role in the implementation

Financial
Knowledge sharing
Operational
Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Our climate change strategy addresses deforestation in our raw material supply chain, with a particular focus on cocoa and palm oil.

Our Palm Oil Action Plan requires suppliers to improve practices across their own entire operations and require the same from their upstream suppliers. It also focuses on risk assessment and engagement of third-party suppliers to drive accountability for traded oil. Key requirements include:
1. Take full responsibility for eliminating deforestation in their own operation and upstream supply chain by mapping and monitoring all plantations and adopting a "suspend and engage" approach requiring immediate suspension of companies involved

in deforestation.
2. Action against the exploitation of worker human rights through adopting the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) Priority Industry Principles on forced labor.
3. Improve traceability and transparency by maintaining, and regularly publishing, universal mill lists with group level owners clearly indicated, as well as using satellite technology to map and monitor sources of palm.
4. Demonstrate implementation of supplier progress against this updated Palm Oil Action Plan as a prerequisite of doing business with Mondelēz International.
5. From 2020, we require traceable, forest-monitored palm oil from mills across our supply chain. New requirements include traceability to plantation and satellite monitoring covering all palm oil concessions supplying mills attributed to the company, against the deforestation criteria set out in its Palm Oil Action Plan.

Due to education and training provided through the Cocoa Life program, farmers are choosing not to expand into protected forests and are focused on protecting the land where cocoa is grown.
Since 2016, we have promoted a coordinated strategy and supply chain transparency by openly publishing our farm mapping updates online. This marked the first time a large cocoa sourcing company had disclosed locations of the cocoa farms they source from. As of 2020, 71% (167,795) of Cocoa Life registered farms, spanning over 258,177 ha, have been mapped and they are not in priority protected forest areas. In partnership with the United Nations Development Programme, as of 2020 we distributed 2,186,243 economic shade trees on cocoa farms in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire and Indonesia to restore forest lands and make farmer cocoa yields more productive.

Climate change related benefit

Emissions reductions (mitigation)
Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
Increase carbon sink (mitigation)

Comment

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

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

Yes

C12.3

(C12.3) Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on climate-related issues through any of the following?

Direct engagement with policy makers
Trade associations

Other

C12.3a

(C12.3a) On what issues have you been engaging directly with policy makers?

Focus of legislation	Corporate position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Other, please specify Sustainable palm oil	Support	We co-chair the Consumer Goods Forum's Palm Oil Working Group, which published palm oil sourcing guidelines for members during 2015; we sat on Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil board from 2014-2018 and contributed actively to the development of RSPO Principle and criteria for sustainable production of palm oil; we supported the NY Declaration on Forests; we supported UNDP's work with the Government of Indonesia and companies to support the scale up of sustainable palm oil in Indonesia via a commodity platform approach. This led to the publication in 2017 of Indonesia's first-ever National Action Plan (NAP) for sustainable palm oil, which provides a national framework for reform. Currently we co-chair CGF- Forest positive coalition of action and contribute towards development of standards and roadmaps towards elimination of deforestation from commodity supply chains.	The goal is to support the scale-up of sustainable palm oil in Indonesia via jurisdictional initiatives such as the Coalition for Sustainable Livelihoods, an initiative set up by Conservation International and public-sector partners focused on collective action to drive economic development, reduce poverty and improve natural resource management in the Indonesian provinces of North Sumatra and Aceh. The project supports the aims of the NAP.
Climate finance	Support	We announced our commitment to combat deforestation in cocoa at the UN Climate Summit COP21, where world leaders met in Paris to negotiate a new climate agreement. Mondelēz International committed to lead private sector action in Côte d'Ivoire's national program to combat deforestation in cocoa. These actions will	In Cote d'Ivoire, we work together with the Ivorian government and other experts to map and monitor forested areas, and train farmers in good agricultural practices and agroforestry. In Ghana, Mondelēz International is contributing $5 million USD over five years to the Ghana Cocoa

		contribute to the United Nations sponsored REDD+ program, with financial support from the World Bank. In January 2018, we agreed to a similar REDD+ partnership with the government of Ghana. In October 2018, we published a case study on our pilot REDD+ programme in Cote d'Ivoire, which is publicly available online.	Forest REDD+ Program (GCFRP), which aims to significantly reduce the high rate of deforestation and forest degradation, as well as their associated greenhouse carbon emissions, from cocoa farming within Ghana's High Forest Zone.

C12.3b

(C12.3b) Are you on the board of any trade associations or do you provide funding beyond membership?

Yes

C12.3c

(C12.3c) Enter the details of those trade associations that are likely to take a position on climate change legislation.

Trade association

Consumer Goods Forum

Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Please explain the trade association's position

The Consumer Goods Forum ("CGF") is a global, parity-based industry network that is driven by its members to encourage the global adoption of practices and standards that serves the consumer goods industry worldwide. It brings together the CEOs and senior management of some 400 retailers, manufacturers, service providers, and other stakeholders across 70 countries, and it reflects the diversity of the industry in geography, size, product category and format. Its member companies have combined sales of EUR 3.5 trillion and directly employ nearly 10 million people, with a further 90 million related jobs estimated along the value chain. It is governed by its Board of Directors, which comprises more than 50 manufacturer and retailer CEOs. The Consumer Goods Forum's environmental sustainability work positions the consumer goods industry as a leader in tackling climate change, reducing waste and improving environmental stewardship in global supply chains. In pulling its weight to tackle climate change, the CGF has identified three key areas where its members are well-positioned to effect significant change. These are:

• Reducing food waste across operations and throughout the rest of the value chain
• Tackling deforestation

• Phasing out the most polluting refrigerants

To help the industry align around a common set of targets, CGF members have publicly committed to certain business practices through resolutions on deforestation (2010), refrigeration (2010 and 2016) and food waste (2015): these issues continue to be recognised as significant sources of greenhouse gasses. There is additional work with stakeholders to drive progress towards broader international goals, such as those set by the UN Sustainable Development Goals with a focus on developing partnerships (SDG 17). The CGF's environmental work is also working on SDG 12 (ensure sustainable consumption for all), SDG 13 (Combat climate change and its impacts) and SDG 15 (Protect the planet). By joining forces and acting collectively, members of The Consumer Goods Forum can have a transformative impact.

How have you influenced, or are you attempting to influence their position?

We actively help develop CGF's refrigeration, deforestation and food waste positions and we resolved to do our part in achieving the Forum's goal of assisting countries achieve net-zero deforestation. We remain active in helping CGF develop its work in this area and co-chaired the development of sourcing guidelines for palm oil - published during 2015 - and contributed to discussions between CGF and the Tropical Forest Alliance.

C12.3e

(C12.3e) Provide details of the other engagement activities that you undertake.

In December 2019, we signed the United for the Paris Agreement letter of support for staying in the Paris Agreement: https://www.unitedforparisagreement.com/

In 2016, we were one of more than 600 US-based companies that signed the "Business Backs Low-Carbon USA" letter calling on US policy makers to continue to support the transition to a low-carbon economy and the Paris Agreement.

C12.3f

(C12.3f) What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?

To maintain consistency, engagement is coordinated by a corporate sustainability team, which includes key functions involved in setting and delivering sustainability strategy, including the Corporate and Government Affairs function, which has responsibility for external engagement. In addition, our Public and Government Affairs team includes sustainability as part of its integrated global strategy. Decisions to participate in engagement relating to climate change are reviewed by key members of the sustainability and public and government affairs teams, under the leadership of the Vice President and Chief Impact Officer and VP and Chief of Global Communications and Government Affairs.

C12.4

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

Publication

In voluntary sustainability report

Status

Complete

Attach the document

2020_MDLZ_Snacking_Made_Right_Report.pdf

Page/Section reference

Governance- pp 55-58
Strategy- pp7-9
Risks & Opportunities
Emissions figures- pp 34-36
Emission targets- pp 9-10, pp34-36
Other metrics- pp 9-10

Content elements

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

Our Snacking Made Right annual report explains our response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in p

Publication

In mainstream reports

Status

Complete

Attach the document

MONDELEZ-INTERNATIONAL-INC_10K_2021.pdf

Page/Section reference

pp 8-9- Sustainability and Wellbeing section
pp 20- Macroeconomic and Industry Risks- Climate change might adversely impact our supply chain or our operations

Content elements

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emission targets

Comment

C13. Other land management impacts

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

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

No

C15. Signoff

C-FI

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

C15.1

(C15.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Vice President and Chief of Global Impact, Sustainability, and Well-being	Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

SC. Supply chain module

SC0.0

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

SC0.1

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

	Annual Revenue
Row 1	

SC0.2

(SC0.2) Do you have an ISIN for your company that you would be willing to share with CDP?

Yes

SC0.2a

(SC0.2a) Please use the table below to share your ISIN.

	ISIN country code (2 letters)	ISIN numeric identifier and single check digit (10 numbers overall)
Row 1	US	6092071058

SC1.1

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

Requesting member

Ahold Delhaize

Scope of emissions

Allocation level

Allocation level detail

Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

Uncertainty (±%)

Major sources of emissions

Verified

Allocation method

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

SC1.2

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

SC1.3

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

Allocation challenges	Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges
Managing the different emission factors of diverse and numerous geographies makes calculating total footprint difficult	Mondelez has various product categories with different emissions profiles, depending on raw materials, production processes and technologies. Our annual footprint analysis is performed at an enterprise level not product level. And our product mix varies across different markets and customers. Therefore, in order to have our emissions allocated to each different customer in each market, we would need to allocate a very large amount of resources to generate a very complex model.

SC1.4

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

SC2.1

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

SC2.2

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

SC4.1

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

No, I am not providing data

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I am submitting to	Public or Non-Public Submission	Are you ready to submit the additional Supply Chain questions?
I am submitting my response	Investors Customers	Public	No, I will complete the Supply Chain questions and return to submit them by the deadline shown on my dashboard. I understand that if I do not return to submit my additional Supply Chain questions by the deadline, they will not be submitted to customers.

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms