Kering - Climate Change 2022

C0. Introduction

C0.1

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

A global Luxury group, Kering manages the development of a series of renowned Houses in Fashion, Leather Goods and Jewelry : Gucci, Saint Laurent, Bottega Veneta, Balenciaga, Alexander McQueen, Brioni, Boucheron, Pomellato, DoDo, Qeelin, as well as Kering Eyewear. By placing creativity at the heart of its strategy, Kering enables its Houses to set new limits in terms of their creative expression while crafting tomorrow's Luxury in a sustainable and responsible way. We capture these beliefs in our signature: "Empowering Imagination". In 2021, Kering had over 42,000 employees and revenue of €17.6 billion.

The Kering share is listed on Euronext Paris (ISIN: FR 0000121485, Reuters: PRTP.PA, Bloomberg: KER.FP). It is notably listed on the CAC 40 and EURO STOXX 50 indexes.

See more at: http://www.kering.com/

C0.2

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Reporting year	January 1 2021	December 31 2021	Yes	3 years

C0.3

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

Aruba
Australia
Austria
Bahrain
Bangladesh
Belgium
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
China, Macao Special Administrative Region
Czechia
France
Germany
Greece
Guam
Hong Kong SAR, China
Hungary
India
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Kuwait
Luxembourg
Malaysia
Mexico
Monaco
Netherlands
New Zealand
Pakistan
Panama
Puerto Rico
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia
Singapore
South Africa
Spain
Switzerland
Taiwan, China
Thailand
Turkey
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Viet Nam

C0.4

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

EUR

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

C0.8

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

Indicate whether you are able to provide a unique identifier for your organization	Provide your unique identifier
Yes, an ISIN code	FR 0000121485

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 Chair	(i) Explanation of how the individual's responsibility is related to climate issues The Chairman of the Board and CEO of Kering is responsible for aligning the global Group's strategy with its sustainability strategy – which includes biodiversity-related targets and goals – by keeping economic, social, and environmental ambitions high and promoting the Group's ethics and the corporate citizenship commitments, reflected through clear policies and tangible initiatives. The Chairman of the Board and CEO is a member of the Sustainability Committee at board level to oversee the Group's sustainability strategy, including its biodiversity-related strategy and issues. 30% of Kering's Chairman of the Board and CEO's variable remuneration is incentivized over non-financial criteria, with a 10% dedicated to Sustainability, including climate-related targets and goals. (ii) Example of a climate-related decision made by the individual Kering's Chairman of the Board and CEO initiated the Fashion Pact in 2019, as a mission given to him by the French President, to bring together over 250 fashion and textile players representing more than one-third of production volumes in the fashion and textile industry and committing them to take action to halt climate change, restore biodiversity and protect the oceans. Following publication of its first progress report in October 2020, the Fashion Pact continued to structure its orgainzation in 2021 and by the end of the year was supervising a total of 14 projects (already launched or in the launch process). The coalition implemented an operations structure, with a Steering Committee bringing together the CEOs of the member brands and an Operations Committee of Chief Sustainability Officers. Kering's CEO served in 2021 as co-chair of the Steering Committee, participating to its 3 meetings. The Fashion Pact's signatories, including Kering, have committed to the implementation of Science Based Targets (SBTs) for Climate to achieve net-zero carbon impact by 2050 . Following this commitment, the Chairman of the Board and CEO made the decision in 2020 to update Kering's Science-based target to be fully aligned with a 1.5°C trajectory. This updated SBT has been approved by the SBTi in April 2021.
Board-level committee	(i) Explanation of how the individual's responsibility is related to climate issues There is a committee dedicated to sustainability at Board level, the Sustainability Committee. In 2021, the Committee was chaired by an independent director and comprised of 5 other members including Kering's Chairman and CEO, the Group Managing Director, two independent directors and one non-independent director. All share extensive and complementary CSR experience. The Sustainability Committee of Kering's Board of Directors oversees this Climate Strategy. Its role is to review the progress of ongoing projects and initiatives, along with the outcomes already achieved in terms of climate-related targets and goals. The SBT1.5°C target was approved in April 2021 and Kering's Climate strategy published in May 2021. The Sustainability Committee's role is to support the Group in establishing, implementing and monitoring good corporate governance, taking into account (1) the aim of the Board of Directors and Executive Management to maintain a high level of sustainability in their economic, social and environmental context, (2) the Group's clear ambitions in terms of ethics, and (3) the corporate citizenship policies and practices (which include climate management) upheld by the Group, its senior executives and employees. (ii) Example of a climate-related decision made by the committee The Sustainability Committee oversees the Group's sustainability strategy, including climate-related issues, and is in charge of reviewing progress on ongoing projects and initiatives and the outcomes already achieved in relation to the 2025 objectives, which includes climate-related targets and goals. In 2021, the Committee reviewed a progress report against the 2025 strategy and made the decision to update the sustainability criterions of the remuneration of corporate officers which rely on climate relate targets. As an example, the Group Managing Director's variable remuneration is incentivized over non-financial criteria, with a 10% dedicated to Sustainability. In 2021, the Sustainability criterion target was the reduction in Kering's environmental impact, in line with the strategy for 2025 which includes climate-related targets.

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Scope of board-level oversight	Please explain
Scheduled – all meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Reviewing and guiding annual budgets Reviewing and guiding business plans Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues	<Not Applicable>	Kering's strategy is based on a multi-brand model built on a long-term approach and creative autonomy of its Houses, backed with 3 key pillars: agility, balance and responsibility. All Kering operations are founded upon a responsible economic model. Kering's comprehensive and sustainable approach is regarded as a structural competitive advantage. As such, the Kering sustainability strategy is integrated within the global strategy as a key success factor of the Group. Kering's 2025 sustainability strategy was designed and validated by the Sustainability Committee in 2016. The Committee reviews annually progress on this strategy, monitors implementation, plans of actions and policies and sets performance objectives. As such, in 2020, the Committee reviewed a progress report against the 2025 strategy. The environmental profit & loss (EP&L) tool, by providing a Euro EP&L impact value that serves as a common financial language across Kering's operations and supply chain, serves as a risk management tool and its yearly results are taken into account at corporate and brand level in the strategic planning of operations and budget. This is one of the main tool considered by the Board when it comes to climate related issues. Kering's sustainability strategy relies on 3 pillars, among which the 'Care for the planet' pillar that establishes a Science-Based Target to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year, reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year.

C1.1d

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

	Board member(s) have competence on climate-related issues	Criteria used to assess competence of board member(s) on climate-related issues	Primary reason for no board-level competence on climate-related issues	Explain why your organization does not have at least one board member with competence on climate-related issues and any plans to address board-level competence in the future
Row 1	Yes	One of the criteria used to assess competence of board members is past experience in climate-related issues. One of Kering's board members has experience as member of the Executive Board of Vivendi Environnement, which became Veolia Environnement (2000 to 2003), Chairman of Dalkia (Vivendi group then Veolia Environnement) (1999 to 2003) and Vice-Chairman of the Paprec Group since October 2021, which provides him with extensive knowledge and competence on environmental related issues, including climate. That board member is also member of the Sustainability board committee and has been assigned with specific responsibility on Climate. He has specific expertise on risk management.	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C1.2

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

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Reporting line	Responsibility	Coverage of responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Half-yearly
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Quarterly

C1.2a

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

(i) Description of the responsibilities of each position and/or committee with regard to the assessment and monitoring of climate-related issues:

The CEO of Kering is responsible for aligning the global Group's strategy with its sustainability strategy, which includes climate-related targets and goals – by keeping economic, social, and environmental ambitions high and promoting the Group's ethics and the corporate citizenship commitments, reflected through clear policies and tangible initiatives. The CEO is a member of the Sustainability Committee at board level to oversee he Group's sustainability strategy, including its climate-related strategy and issues.

Kering's Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) is a member of the Executive Committee and directly reports to Kering's Chairman and CEO, who appointed her in 2012.

The CSO is directly responsible for the climate strategy as part of Kering's overall sustainability strategy. She reports to the Board's Sustainability Committee that oversees the Group's 2025 sustainability strategy. It includes climate strategy, targets, and goals. The Sustainability Committee and the CSO met once in 2021 to closely monitor the sustainability strategy's implementation and target progress.

As Kering's CSO has direct responsibility for the definition, assessment and monitoring of the Group's Sustainability and climate strategies. She has direct managerial responsibility for a team of 30+ sustainability experts at Group-level, who are in charge of sustainability operational management across the Group and its supply chain, on all sustainability matters including climate-related ones, and who assist the brands with implementing the Group's sustainability strategy by systematically looking for potential synergies and continuous improvement.

Kering's CSO has direct operational and reporting responsibility to the Sustainability Committee and the board for the 2025 sustainability strategy , including specific climate management progress (namely, Science Based Target, GHG emission reduction commitments as part of the -40% EP&L target by 2025, 100% raw materials compliance to the Kering Standards by 2025) and the roll-out of corresponding programs.

In the context of its 2025 sustainability strategy and its updated Science-Based Targets in 2021, Kering has several climate-related commitments which are under responsibility of Kering's CSO :

1) To reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year.

2) To increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022

3) To reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year

4) To further address the environmental impacts generated along its supply chain by reducing the Group's EP&L (environmental profit and loss) account by 40%. This includes GHG emissions, which are one of the 6 key indicators of the EP&L methodology.

5) To achieve carbon neutrality across the group by 2050. In addition to implementing emissions reduction initiatives, this is also currently done through the offsetting of all Kering's GHG emissions from Scope 1, 2, and 3 on a voluntary basis (excluding use phase and end of life of products).

6) To reach 100% of raw materials compliant with Kering Standards by 2025, which implies 100% fulfillment of enclosed climate-related guidelines in Kering's direct operations and supply chain (such as requirements for leather farming practices with lower GHG emissions, recommendations to source green energy for gold extraction processes, or Clean-By-Design programme recommendation for textile processing mills).

C1.3

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

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

C1.3a

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

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Board Chair	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Since 2016, acting on a recommendation of the Remuneration Committee, the Board has introduced equally weighted non-financial performance criteria that would base 30% of the annual variable remuneration on three areas underpinning the Group's strategy: organisation and talent management, Corporate Social Responsibility and sustainability. From this point forward, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer's variable remuneration is linked to the extent to which these targets are achieved. Non-financial targets are assessed by the Board, after taking into account the performance of the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. This assessment is based on a detailed proposal prepared by the Remuneration Committee, which is strongly based on objective information reported by the Head of the Legal Department, the Head of Human Resources and the Head of Remuneration and Employee Benefits in relation to the strategic goals defined at the beginning of the year. In 2021, one of these targets was linked to the implementation of the new 2025 Group sustainability strategy, which includes a specific science-based target for GHG emissions (SBT aligned with 1.5°C trajectory): an absolute reduction of scope 1&2 emissions by 90% and a decrease of scope 3 emissions per unit value added by 70% by 2030 compared to a 2015 baseline.
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Since 2016, acting on a recommendation of the Remuneration Committee, the Board has introduced equally weighted non-financial performance criteria that would base 30% of the annual variable remuneration on three areas underpinning the Group's strategy: organisation and talent management, Corporate Social Responsibility and sustainability. From this point forward, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer's variable remuneration is linked to the extent to which these targets are achieved. Non-financial targets are assessed by the Board, after taking into account the performance of the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. This assessment is based on a detailed proposal prepared by the Remuneration Committee, which is strongly based on objective information reported by the Head of the Legal Department, the Head of Human Resources and the Head of Remuneration and Employee Benefits in relation to the strategic goals defined at the beginning of the year. In 2021, one of these targets was linked to the implementation of the new 2025 Group sustainability strategy, which includes a specific science-based target for GHG emissions (SBT aligned with 1.5°C trajectory): an absolute reduction of scope 1&2 emissions by 90% and a decrease of scope 3 emissions per unit value added by 70% by 2030 compared to a 2015 baseline.
Business unit manager	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Brand Directors and business unit managers' variable compensation depends on several objectives including sustainability targets, among which reaching the Group's CO2 target – especially for managers who have an influence on CO2 emissions through their position. Indeed, since 2021, Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5°C.
Management group	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Senior managers' variable compensation depends on several objectives including sustainability targets, among which reaching the Group's CO2 target. Indeed, since 2020, Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5°C.
Environment/Sustainability manager	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Sustainability managers' variable compensation depends on several objectives including sustainability targets, among which reaching the Group's CO2 target. Indeed, since 2020, Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5°C.
Energy manager	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction target Efficiency target	Energy managers' variable compensation depends on several objectives including sustainability targets, among which reaching the Group's CO2 target. Indeed, since 2020, Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5°C.
Chief Procurement Officer (CPO)	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Supply chain engagement	At Kering, the Strategic Sourcing & Procurement Director, reporting to the Managing Director, has oversight and responsibility over strategic sourcing and procurement decisions. The SS&P department encompasses a Sustainability Team. As part of the management group, the director's variable compensation depends on several objectives including sustainability targets, among which reaching the Group's CO2 target. Indeed, since 2020, Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. The targets covering greenhouse gas emissions from company operations (scopes 1 and 2) are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5°C.
Procurement manager	Non-monetary reward	Environmental criteria included in purchases Supply chain engagement	At Kering, the Group's Indirect Purchasing Director is in charge of the Indirect Purchasing Department. The Indirect Purchasing Department is committed to responsible sourcing based on a reciprocal undertaking with suppliers to respect the Kering Code of Ethics. It also has specific commitments tailored to each category of purchases, with buyers identifying the most relevant sustainability criteria. Today, all buyers are trained and made aware of responsible purchasing practices, and all purchases include CSR selection specifications and/or criteria.

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	Kering considers short-term horizon to be the range 0-1 years as aligned with the annual financial calendar terms of large international undertakings such as Kering.
Medium-term	1	10	Kering considers medium-term horizon to be the range 1-10 years, as the typical range for defining and implementing mid-term strategic plans and sustainability plans. Sustainability plans, due to their nature of addressing extra-financial risks and opportunities, usually cover medium term actions for which 1 to 10 years is a reasonable time range for achieving a positive return-on-investment. Therefore, this horizon allows for the sustainability plans to be integrated in the strategic plans of the company without the extra-financial actions being detrimental to the short- and mid-term financial performance of the company, while bringing long-term value to the company, the planet and the society.
Long-term	10	50	Kering considers long-term horizon to be the range 10-50 years, as the range for: - climate change and other critical extra-financial risks to generate tangible impacts within this timeframe, and typical mid- and long-term mitigation or adaption actions to reach relevant results, - typical mid- and long-term extra-financial opportunities to bring value to the company, the planet and the society. This time horizon is aligned with the internationally-recognized climate research from the IPCC and more specifically the publicly available IPCC – Fifth Assessment Report's RCP1.9 known as the 1.5°C scenario, on which Kering had its Science-Based Target (SBT) commitments validated in 2021 as part of its long-term strategy. This time horizon is also aligned with the pivotal report that Kering co-authored with BSR on climate change and the fashion industry today: “Climate change: implications and strategies for the Luxury Fashion sector”. This report presents how climate change is influencing the Group’s long-term strategy and more broadly how this will affect fashion companies in the future (beyond 2050). As a first analysis of climate change and its consequences for the Luxury sector, the report aims to help Luxury fashion companies understand their specific vulnerabilities to climate change, and to provide guidance on building new and more resilient business models, such as how to build resilience in supply chains through a focus on both enhanced efficiency and innovative approaches to raw material production with actions and solutions that are already available for businesses. As a key input for this study, Kering commissioned a detailed report from Verisk Maplecroft into the climate change risk and vulnerabilities of six key raw materials (the ‘Kering-Maplecroft’ report). The research by Verisk Maplecroft focused on regions of the world where the raw materials (particularly high-quality varieties) are produced, and it evaluates the impact of climate change on these regions over the next 50 years and beyond (as projected for the time period 2036-2060). http://www.kering.com/sites/default/files/document/bsr_kering_report_climate_change_implications_and_strategies_for_the_luxury_fashion_sector.pdf

C2.1b

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

(i) Definition of 'substantive financial or strategic impact' when identifying or assessing climate-related risks

The risks identified by the Group have been ranked according to their level of criticality, on a scale ranging from 1 (very critical) to 4 (less critical), which is based on the probability of their occurrence and the magnitude of their impacts. Impacts are classified according to 4 levels : high, significant, medium and low. Probability of occurrence is classified in 4 categories : unlikely, rather likely, likely, very likely. See p291 of the 2021 URD
https://www.kering.com/assets/front/documents/Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf

Financial impacts, as defined in the risk management system presented are impacts on the Group’s financial results and/or likely to result in a cash outflow. Strategic impacts, are impacts on the ability of the Group and it Houses to implement their strategy.

(ii) description of the quantifiable indicator(s) used to define substantive financial or strategic impact

The financial indicator that is used to define substantive impact is the EBIT (Recurring operating income). A financial or strategic impact is considered to be substantive when it has an impact on at least 1% of the EBIT (50,17 M€ based on 2021 recurring operating income).

Climate change is identified in Kering's Group risk map as one of the 14 main risk factors (level of criticality 2). Climate change could affect Kering's supply chain : the growing frequency of extreme weather events (drought, flooding, etc.) could have a direct impact on the availability and quality of key raw materials such as leather, cotton, cashmere and silk, which would translate into greater price volatility, and thus affect the production and distribution of finished products. Potential related impacts identified include substantive financial and strategic impacts. Indeed, raw materials suppliers identified as key to the Group represent roughly 20% of all raw materials suppliers, corresponding to approximately 80% of purchases.

Kering considers that extreme meteorological events can have negative impacts on agricultural production such as reduced harvest, in turn generating commodity price volatility or putting production at risk. The reduction of resource availability may potentially strongly increase operational costs of Kering businesses as they heavily rely on agricultural raw materials e.g. leather, cotton, silk or precious skins. Physical changes of water availability could also impact available arable land and crops such as cotton or silk might become exhausted. This may similarly impact availability and cost of these natural resources on a long term.

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
More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered
Short-term
Medium-term
Long-term

Description of process
Within Kering's risk management policy, the Executive Management created a "Group Risk Committee" in 2011, which reviews the monitoring of the topicality and relevance of strategic, operational, reporting and compliance risks, and the analysis of general and specific risks. It identifies the most material risks and opportunities, including climate-related ones. The main criteria considered to assess materiality are magnitude of potential consequences, probability of occurrence, and vulnerability. Kering's Risk Committee reviews the monitoring process for the Group's risk management policy and validates the roll-out of action plans to better respond to identified risks, in cluding climate related. At Corporate level, Kering implemented a risk management policy shared with the internal control department and the Executive Management teams of divisions and brands, which describes the methods used by Kering for the risk analysis conducted every 2 years. Deployed under the supervision of the Risk Committee, Kering's risk management policy is consistent between corporate level and the Brands (asset level). The Group risk identification and assessment process strongly relies on its CSR team and brands contributions. At Brand level, the bi-annual continuous process involves identifying, centralizing and analyzing risks (including climate related risks) by reviewing the potential consequences (financial, human, legal, or reputational) and assessing whether they may occur as well as the level of risk control, at three different time horizons (short, medium, long term). The risk assessment done under the control of the Group Risk Committee is covering direct operations, supply chain (upstream) as well as downstream potential issues (image, distribution network...). It provides also an assessment of the time horizon at which the risk may occur (short, medium, long term). Risks are identified based on the annual survey shared to both Kering's internal and external stakeholders, which includes questions about extra-financial risks. The TCFD analysis is also integrated in the Group's strategic watch to keep the list of climate-related risks and opportunities that could impact Kering up to date. Kering uses a materiality matrix to prioritize climate-related risks. An international consultation of Kering's stakeholders was conducted in 2020 to update this materiality analysis (first published in 2014). This materiality matrix maps and prioritizes Kering's risks, including climate-related ones, according to expectations of both internal and external stakeholders, and Kering's 2025 Strategy. The results of this analysis showed that climate change and biodiversity are the top priority risks for Kering's internal and external stakeholders. Climate-related opportunities are addressed bi-annually through the Sustainability Committee overseeing sustainability strategy and issues at Group level. It is assisted by Kering's CSO, member of the Executive Committee, who is directly responsible for the climate strategy and for identifying climate-related opportunities by liaising sustainability expertise with strategic sustainability vision, bringing them to the attention of the board and addressing them depending on strategic decisions. The approach is covering the entire value chain (direct operations, as well as upstream and downstream activities) and is considering different time horizon (short, medium, long term). Kering responds to identified climate risks and opportunities by developing a specific climate strategy, based on a scientific approach and by aligning its climate policy and structuring its targets using the Science-Based Target (SBT) standards. The Climate Strategy is overseen by the Sustainability Committee of Kering's Board of Directors who review ongoing progress and outcomes of achieved projects. Kering is undertaking a scenario analysis of climate risks and opportunities in order to deepen its understanding of the implications of climate change for the Group and its supply chain. This also supports ongoing decisions on priority action plans across the business. At the same time, Kering is also committed to understand and address the potential financial implications of physical and transition climate risks on operations. Action plans are in place to manage potential impacts that are yet materialized, in line with the TCFD recommendations. The Climate Strategy sets out in detail the commitments, objectives and actions implemented by the Group to respond to climate-related risks and opportunities, starting with the monitoring of the Environmental Profit and Loss (EP&L) account which allows Kering to measure its environmental impacts, including its carbon footprint, throughout the value chain and to monetize them. The EP&L is used as a group-level strategic management tool for sourcing decisions, in terms of sourcing strategy and choice of materials (location, production processes, etc.). The EP&L provides a Euro EP&L impact value that serves as a common financial language across Kering's operations and supply chain and provides a comparable value point between types of raw materials, manufacturing processes and locations. This support Kering in choosing how to respond to a climate-related risks.

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	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Kering considers current regulations regarding climate change as relevant risks included in its climate risk assessment. Climate-related regulatory risks are part of both the 'Climate change, other natural or man-made risks' and the 'Compliance with national tax laws and international standards' risk categories identified as strategic and operational risks covered by Kering's risk framework. The implementation of stricter environmental regulations and standards to meet the challenges associated with climate change could have an impact on the Group's activities by increasing production costs and reducing operational flexibility. (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: The 2019 French Energy Climate Law requires major institutional investors to explain how they take ESG criteria into account in their risk management and investment policies and to report on the impacts of both physical and transition risks caused by climate change on their activities and assets. This generates significant reporting needs at the level of investee companies such as Kering considering its shareholder base (8.1% being French institutional investors). Several investors have required Kering to complete questionnaires and provide information on climate risk, in addition to the CDP response. Not being able to report sufficient ESG and climate data could potentially undermine Kering's relationship with investors, which could create a loss of attractivity in Kering shares, especially since sustainability is at the heart of Kering's growth strategy. A dedicated Head of Sustainability disclosure oversees the communication with investors on ESG issues. Moreover, the 2019 French Anti-waste Law for a circular economy includes several pillars to change the production methods of companies (including Kering) and the consumption patterns of citizens, including phasing out disposable plastic, better informing consumers and fighting against waste and for solidarity reuse with the prohibited destruction of non-food unsold products. A control action already in place is the inclusion of the Energy and Climate Law article 29 considerations in Kering's internal control processes and the appointment of a Head of Environmental Excellence & Circularity to further accelerate Kering's efforts and innovation in this regard.

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Kering considers emerging regulations regarding climate change as relevant risks included in its climate risk assessment. Climate-related regulatory risks are part of both the 'Climate change, other natural or man-made risks' risk category and the 'Compliance with national tax laws and international standards' category, identified as 2 categories of the strategic and operational risks covered by Kering's risk framework (see 2021 URD p.312). (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: Regulation introducing a carbon tax is still under discussion in France, where Kering is headquartered, for road transportation and might cover other transports modes in the coming years, especially air freight that Kering uses for transportation of raw materials and products. As mapproximately 80% of Kering's CO2 emissions in 2021 are due to logistics, including 66% due to B2B transportation which is mainly air freight and 5% due to business air travel, and considering that our high-value products need a robust distribution network, the introduction of carbon taxes linked to transportation activities would imply significant business and operational impacts on our supply chain, by increasing direct costs linked to Kering's logistics. Another example of potential emerging regulation regards product labelling regulations and standards. A voluntary-based initiative on product environmental labelling has been launched by the French government 7 years ago and is currently under implementation at European level. An example of control action already in place is participation to national/regional government-led experiments. Kering has been participating since their launch to environmental labelling initiatives through both the Organisation Environmental Footprint (OEF) and Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) platforms, which are working on defining the regulation or standard that could be adopted at the French or European level. Participation to these initiatives is therefore a way for Kering to anticipate future requirements. As 23% of Kering's sales in 2021 are done in Western Europe, such regulations are likely to impact our business and our brand image, especially since sustainability and products with a low environmental impact are at the heart of Kering's growth strategy.
Technology	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Technological risks are identified under the 'Information systems' and 'Cybersecurity' risk categories of the strategic and operational risks covered by Kering's risk framework (see 2021 URD p.306), due to the fact that most of the Group's production and transaction processes rely on information systems. However, technological improvements or innovations that support the transition to a lower-carbon, energy-efficient economic system are mostly regarded by Kering as opportunities to accelerate further the transition rather than a risk to Kering's activities. This is why these risks are regarded as relevant, sometimes included, depending on the specific technology under consideration. In terms of technology climate opportunities, Kering aims to stimulate innovation, transform its traditional processes and encourage the widespread adoption of more sustainable practices, including energy and CO2 emissions reduction projects. For example, Kering is a founding partner of the Plug and Play-Fashion for Good accelerator, a partnership formed to increase the pace at which innovation is integrated into the luxury and apparel sectors, taking sustainability criteria, such as energy and climate criteria, into account. (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: An example of technology risk that could affect Kering in the medium term (1-10 years) is impeded access to traceability technologies (blockchain) which could put Kering at a competitive disadvantage, impair access to key high quality and low-impact raw materials, and increase the cost to access blockchain technology. This could in turn affect Kering's brand image. Traceability is crucial: it is essential to identify the specific regions in which raw materials are produced, to assess their vulnerability to climate change, and to implement mitigation programmes. The fashion sector is significantly investing in innovative traceability technologies. Kering mitigates this risk by actively working on innovative solutions (Oritain) based on forensic science, to develop 100% traceable materials such as organic cotton. Kering has set partnerships to secure access to use forensic science and statistical analysis to analyse the naturally-occurring chemical properties of the cotton fiber and create a unique chemical fingerprint that links cotton back to the field in which it was grown.
Legal	Relevant, always included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Kering considers legal risks as relevant risks included in its climate risk assessment. Legal risks are identified as a dedicated risk category of the strategic and operational risks covered by Kering's risk framework (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: Failure to adequately meet local or more stringent climate-related regulations could generate legal impacts, inducing potential fines and an exposure to litigation. Reviewing the potential legal consequences of non-compliance is systematically included as part of the risk analysis process. To closely monitor the evolution of regulations and ensure Kering's compliance throughout the geographical locations of its operations and supply chain, the Group has formed legal and compliance organisations at regional (Asia, the Americas and Europe), local (subsidiaries), and central levels. For example, Kering is subject to the French Duty of Care law, an obligation for companies to prevent social, environmental and governance risks related to their activities. Non-compliance with this law is a risk for French companies including Kering, and an increasing number of French companies are being sued by NGOs and individuals for non-compliance with this law. The risk mapping process required by this law, covering Kering and its value chain, was carried out in 2017 across the Luxury business, under the supervision of a Group coordination committee comprising members from departments including Compliance, Sustainability and Internal Audit, and following consultation with a panel of stakeholders. Pursuant to Article L. 225-102-4 of the French Commercial Code, Kering's duty of care plan sets out the measures brought in across the Group to identify risks and prevent severe impacts on human rights and fundamental freedoms, human health and safety, or the environment including climate change, resulting directly or indirectly from the operations of Kering or of companies under its control.
Market	Relevant, always included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Kering considers market risk a relevant climate risk to its business. Market risks are a broad category identified under several risk categories of the strategic and operational risks covered by Kering's risk framework, the most relevant with regard to climate being the following categories: "Raw materials scarcity, quality and biodiversity", including raw materials volatility, "Kering's luxury paradigm and business model" and "Customer experience", including consumer expectations and market changes, and "Image and branding". (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: In 2015 Kering co-authored with BSR a report focusing on how climate change is influencing Group's long-term strategy and how this this will affect fashion companies in the future (beyond 2050). The report defines market risk as a risk of change in market demand created by climate change. This includes potential changes in demand for specific products and in the effectiveness of marketing messaging. It may become increasingly relevant to consider products that work well with less distinct seasonal changes and warmer temperatures. In terms of marketing, brands may want to express their commitment to mitigating climate change in different ways. The new client segments driving luxury brand growth are millennials and 'aspirationals.' Aspirationals represent 51% of consumers in China, love shopping (93%), and want to do so responsibly (95%). Increasing expectations linked to societal and environmental issues are especially growing with customers from generations Y and Z. These generations are expected to account for a 180% growth in the personal luxury goods market between 2019 and 2025 and to represent 65% to 70% of the market in 2025 compared to 57% in 2020 (2021 URD p. 39). Brands that ignore this new consciousness risk maintaining an outdated positioning (e.g. losing market shares). This is especially relevant for Kering, which has placed sustainability at the heart of its growth strategy. Examples of control action already in place are the creation of the EP&L tool serving as a management tool to orient Kering towards sustainable sourcing solutions and the introduction of market offers such as Gucci Off the Grid with new ways of how sustainability can power creativity and underline the House's values.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Kering considers reputational risk a relevant climate risk to its business and as such includes it in its risk assessment process. "Image and branding" risks are identified as a dedicated risk category of the strategic and operational risks covered by Kering's risk framework. In 2015 Kering co-authored with BSR a report focusing on how climate change is influencing Group's long-term strategy and more broadly how this this will affect fashion companies in the future (beyond 2050). This report identified major climate risks for the luxury sector as input risks, physical risks, market risks, stakeholder risks and regulatory risks. (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: As an example of reputation risk, the report defines stakeholder risk as a risk that comes from failing to deliver against expectations from stakeholders who care about the changing climate. Just as luxury brands face evolving consumer needs and expectations, they also face the influence of other key stakeholders, such as civil society, employees, and investors, who increasingly have concerns about climate performance. Kering is included in a number of ESG and SRI funds and receives regular investors' questions pertaining to its environmental performance and climate strategy. Several investors have required Kering to complete questionnaires and provide information on climate risk, in addition to the CDP response. A resulting impact would be the divestment of one of Kering's institutional investors and a resulting loss in share attractiveness. The divestment movement has shown how many stakeholders hold investment portfolio managers and companies accountable for climate impacts. Investors themselves, a key stakeholder for luxury, are increasingly including climate risk in their decision-making by taking into account metrics such as DJSI, transparency on reporting climate risk, and CDP results on which is based, for instance, the 'Euronext CDP Environment France EW' index launched by Euronext and Goldman Sachs in 2018 and in 2019. An example of control action already in place is continuing dialogue with stakeholders, as exemplified by Kering's collaborations with NGOs and experts such as BSR.
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Acute physical risks are considered relevant and included in Kering's risk assessment process and framework, which takes into account the growing frequency of extreme weather events and "Other natural or man-made risk", covering natural disasters. In 2015 Kering co-authored with BSR a report focusing on how climate change is influencing Group's long-term strategy and more broadly how this this will affect fashion companies in the future (beyond 2050). This report identified major climate risks for the luxury sector as input risks, physical risks, market risks, stakeholder risks and regulatory risks. According to the IPCC 5th assessment report, the impact of climate change is likely to be 'severe, pervasive, and irreversible' as a result of increased, unprecedented GHG concentrations in the atmosphere'. The report defines a physical risk as a risk to the security of and access to a company's own operations and assets. Increased intensity and frequency of extreme climate-related weather hazards can impede manufacturing operations and disrupt the transportation of raw materials and finished goods. It can also increase workforce instability in operations and supply chains, while impinging on consumers' access to retail stores. (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: Extreme meteorological events can have significant negative impacts on agricultural production, thereby reducing resource availability and raising commodity prices. This could increase Kering's operational costs considerably, as the Group relies on several agricultural raw materials such as cashmere which is key for Kering. For example, during the winter of 2017-2018, a severe drought led to the loss of cashmere goats, leading to reduced cashmere availability and to a 30-50% price increase. These physical risks could impact Kering's value chain, by intensifying the need for diversifying cashmere sourcing regions and further developing regenerative agricultural practices with suppliers. To mitigate these risks, Kering works with suppliers to implement sustainable agriculture practices and develops pilot projects (South Gobi Cashmere Project), to redefine high quality and sustainable cashmere production in the Mongolian steppe. The EP&L tool is also used to orient the Group towards sustainable sourcing solutions according to geography and impacts of raw materials such as cashmere.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	(i) Justification of the decision on the relevance and inclusion of this risk: Chronic physical risks are considered relevant and included in Kering's risk assessment process. Climate risk is identified as a dedicated strategic and operational risk covered by Kering's risk framework, which considers long-term shifts in climate patterns (higher temperatures resulting in sea level rise or chronic heat waves). The economic environment and even the social stability of certain regions (such as coastal regions in Asia) could be severely impacted by the effects of climate change, which would further increase pressure on the Group's supply chain. It can also affect the livelihood and mobility of people, due to degradation of biodiversity and ecosystem services (water filtration, soil replenishment, crop pollination…). This could increase workforce instability in operations and supply chains and impinge on consumers' access to retail stores. (ii) Example of a specific risk considered in our assessment: Long-term impacts of climate change like chronic changes in water availability, changes in climate patterns or rising temperatures resulting from climate change can have significant negative impacts on agricultural production. This could increase Kering's operational costs considerably, as the Group relies on several agricultural raw materials such as leather which is key for Kering, as leather-based products represent approximately 71% of Kering's revenue. For example, increased heat stress measured by the Temperature Humidity Index may affect cattle rearing in key sourcing regions, reducing leather availability and increasing the cost of leather hides, which could possibly result in a strong increase in Kering's operational costs. To mitigate these risks Kering monitors its key leather sourcing areas, favoring locations identified as less vulnerable to heat stress. Kering also pursues the development of alternatives to leather, the transition to a circular model promoting the upcycling of leather leftovers and the support of producers at the front lines of agricultural change in 17 countries as they test Kering's regenerative practices which favour climate-mitigation through the Regenerative Fund for Nature. Another example of control action already in place is the EP&L tool, a management tool to orient the Group towards sustainable sourcing solutions according to geography and impacts of raw materials such as leather.

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?
Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical	Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Primary potential financial impact
Increased direct costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
The worldwide personal luxury goods market enjoyed solid growth of 5% per year from 2014 to 2019, while major listed groups typically outperformed, with growth of around 11%. Sector sales in 2021 totaled €283 billion, according to Bain & Altagamma. The revenue generated by leather goods in 2021 is estimated at €62 billion, or 22% of total personal luxury goods revenue, making it the sector's largest category. The Shoes category represented 8% of the luxury goods market in 2021, or €23 billion in revenue. It was the industry's most dynamic category, with sales up 11% as reported relative to 2019, driven by the trend towards less formal shoes such as sneakers. Leather, especially bovine leather (calf/cow) is a key component of the market and a key raw material for Luxury Groups. The chronic physical risk of the impact of heat stress on cow/calf leather can have direct impact on leather hides availability, quality and therefore cost, representing potentially substantive financial impact on Kering business. Leather-based products are indeed representing approximately 71% of Kering's total revenue (Leather Goods and Shoes business units). Leather was identified as a raw material which is particularly vulnerable to climate change, based on the expertise of Kering's sourcing and environmental specialists with the support of specialised consultants. Key sourcing regions for Kering include Europe, which represents more than 60% of volumes, South America, the United States and Australia. These countries are already being impacted by climate change, as exemplified by measures of the Temperature Humidity Index (THI). The THI is an indicator of heat stress that can be used on cattle. Heat stress depends on a multiplicity of variables such as temperature, relative humidity, sunshine, wind and precipitation. The heat waves due to climate change can increase the THI load, which means that cattle are exposed to more severe heat stress. According to a third-party analysis, this THI could reach high levels under RCP8.5 scenario by 2035 in Italy, USA, South America, Spain and Australia. This means that some areas may not be appropriate for cattle in a RCP8.5 scenario, resulting in a decrease in their availability. According to the analysis a 3x relative increase in heat stress was estimated by 2035, leading to an estimated 3% decrease in hides availability. This would impact market-price of leather hides, and could potentially increase Kering's leather procurement costs.

Time horizon
Long-term

Likelihood
Likely

Magnitude of impact
Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
3100000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
4200000

Explanation of financial impact figure
A TCFD-aligned study was conducted by Kering with a specialized external and independent consultancy, to provide an initial estimate of the potential annual financial impact on Kering's EBITDA of heat stress on cow/calf leather availability by 2035. The financial range has been determined based on the following scenarios: -Low range: limited heat stress in a Paris ambition scenario (+1,5°C – RCP 4.5) -High range: increased heat stress in a no mitigation scenario (+4°C – RCP 8.5) The assessment and approach are detailed below : 1) Focus on strategic sourcing regions : 80% of cow/calf leather volume sourced by Kering in 2019 and 2020 was collected, as well as the location of abattoir (as proxy for the sourcing region) 2) Study the increase in heat and water stress on Kering supply chain based on United-Nations IPCC and World Resource Institute data. This analysis showed an up to 3 time relative increase in heat stress (THI load) by 2035 in the most impacted regions (RCP8.5 scenario) 3) Analyze the impact on cow/calf hide availability: third-party modeling based on peer-reviewed academic research, to analyze of the impact of heat stress on mortality and calving. This analysis showed an up to 3% estimated decrease in cow/calf hide availability by 2035 in the most extreme scenario (RCP8.5 scenario). 4) Estimate the financial impact of reduced hide availability: third-party modeling based on historical market and planned evolution of the market on leather price and production volume from the Food and Agriculture Organisation, and projected use of Kering cow/calf leather resulted in the estimation of the financial impacts of forecasted reduction in leather availability. This analysis showed that a 1% decrease in hide availability would lead to a 0.37% increase in price. Based on this assessment, the annual financial losses for Kering have been estimated to amount between €3.1M in a scenario aligned with the Paris Agreement and €4.2M in a scenario with no mitigation actions, by 2035.

Cost of response to risk
2300000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
(i) Explanation of cost of management The annual budget of Kering sustainability department is 10€M covering mainly OpEx and CapEx for the operation of the department and its projects. Budget is allocated based on the level of importance and prioritization by the Group, in line with the materiality matrix. It is estimated that issue related to the resilience of kering supply chain takes up around 13% of the time/ ressource or around €1.3M, for sustainable sourcing. Cattle rearing being part of the upstream supply chain, and not directly operated by Kering, the cost of response covers CAPEX as well as OPEX such as the management costs pertaining to the wages of Kering's specialists. In addition, the Kering Fund for Regenerative Agriculture that supports projects to transform farming and breeding practices in areas that supply raw materials to the fashion industry has been endowed with €5 million over five years or an estimated annual budget of €1M. Total annual budget is estimated at €2.3M (€1.3M+€1M) (ii) Case study of company-specific activities 1) Situation: Leather is a key raw material for Kering as it represents ~71% of revenue. It may be vulnerable to climate-change as heat stress may affect cattle rearing in key sourcing regions 2) Task: ensure leather is sourced in a sustainable way 3) Action: Kering put in place a team of specialists on raw material sourcing, who work towards the implementation of Kering Standards for leather and to reinforce supplier-relationship management, as illustrated by the Vendor Rating System developed in 2020. Kering implemented a platform for all suppliers to continuously assess the implementation of the Kering Standards in view of achieving the target of 100% adherence to Kering standards for leather by 2025. Minimum requirements for leather suppliers include promoting the ecological sustainability of livestock production methods and avoiding the degradation and destruction of natural ecosystems. These actions support suppliers to improve their resilience against heat stress, by developing regenerative agricultural practices which improve the recharging of water systems and contribute to slowing desertification, in line with Kering's 2025 biodiversity strategy. 4) Results: in 2021, alignment with Kering standards reached 68% for leather. Kering has pledged that 100% of the key raw materials used by the Group – and the production processes using these materials – will comply with the Kering Standards by 2025.

Comment
Kering created a Supplier Sustainability Index which ensures Kering's high standards for raw materials and processes are implemented by all suppliers by 2025, which also raises the bar on traceability. In 2021, 93% of leather was traceable back to the slaughterhouse. Kering has pledged that 100% of the key raw materials used by the Group – and the production processes using these materials – will comply with the Kering Standards by 2025. In 2020, Kering implemented an internal procedure for monitoring animal welfare in its leather supply chain to ensure that practices established by suppliers are aligned with the requirements described in the Kering Standards. Due to the COVID-19 health crisis, these audits had to be replaced by self-assessments and documentary reviews of processes in place. In 2021, 68% of leather was aligned with the Kering Standards.

Identifier
Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?
Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation	Carbon pricing mechanisms

Primary potential financial impact
Increased direct costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
The transition risk of a strengthening of carbon pricing policy might have financial impacts on Kering, which is a French company and operates in a context of a strengthening carbon market and potential new carbon taxation, especially in Europe (ambitious Green Deal Policy). Kering conducted an analysis to map current and future carbon pricing mechanisms. The study found that 80% of Kering's emissions occur in regions with carbon pricing mechanisms. These carbon pricing mechanisms would mostly impact the following categories: - transportation - energy - packaging and metals Regarding transportation in 2021, 82.6% of Kering's Tier 0 C02 emissions are linked to transport, which remains under Kering's operational control. The key category is B2B transportation, of which air freight represents 64% in t.km. In terms of air freight C02 emissions, 71% comes from Italy, 22% from France and 7% from UK, which is more and more subject to the European Emission Trading Scheme and taxation. This could increase the price on air freight for Kering and its freight forwarders and could imply potential additional business, financial and operational impacts on our supply chain, due to switching transport modes. Regarding energy, Kering's CO2 emissions in 2021 amount to 52,491 tons of CO2. Reinforced carbon pricing policies could increase energy procurement costs, though Kering is mitigating this risk by reducing its Scope 1 and 2 emissions, and by sourcing green electricity. 92% of our electricity is green, contributing to the 70% decrease in our CO2 emissions linked to energy consumption since 2015. Kering uses fossil fuel for heating that could be subject to reinforced carbon taxes. Regarding packaging and metals, Kering analysed the impact of potential carbon pricing mechanisms on its packaging, including paper and cardboard, which represent the bulk of Kering's packaging volumes in 2021 (84%), as well as metals which have a significant CO2 emission factor.

Time horizon
Long-term

Likelihood
Likely

Magnitude of impact
Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
3300000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
7800000

Explanation of financial impact figure
A TCFD-aligned study was conducted by Kering with a specialised external and independent consultancy, to provide an initial estimate of the potential annual financial impact on Kering's EBITDA of carbon pricing by 2035. The financial range has been determined based on the following scenarios : -Low range : limited carbon price in a no mitigation scenario (+4°C – RCP 8.5), in which only current and announced carbon price mechanisms are implemented, and prices stagnate approximately at 30€/tCO2 in average by 2030 -High range : high carbon price in a Paris ambition scenario (+1,5°C – RCP 4.5), in which high carbon price supports the transition towards a low carbon economy, and prices reach an average of 75 €/tC02 in average by 2030 in OECD countries The assessment and approach are detailed below : 1) Focus on Kering's carbon hotspots : data was collected for GHG emissions per source and country for 2019 and 2020 from Kering EP&L. Direct emissions logistics, and packaging and metals were identified as the key carbon hotspots. 2) Review of current and forecasted carbon pricing mechanisms based on Worldbank/ Caisse Des Depots database for current

prices and United-Nations IPCC modelling for future prices. 3) Analysis of the impact on direct emissions, logistics and packaging production costs : estimation of Kering future GHG emissions as well as the percentage emission covered by carbon pricing mechanisms based on expert survey. 4) Analysis of the net impact on Kering's purchase of good and services : estimation of the ability of suppliers to transfer the increase in carbon price to Kering based on expert's survey.

Cost of response to risk
2500000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
(i) Case study of company-specific activities which aim to address the risk 1) Situation: Kering's supply chain relies on efficient transport between continents, especially Asia and Europe. 2) Task: Ensure the efficient operation of the supply chain, while working towards reducing CO2 emissions 3) Action: Kering put in place a team of dedicated specialists on transport, energy and packaging, who work towards building new logistics schemes such as increasing the share of sea freight to replace air freight. Thanks to our experienced logistics teams and work with our Houses and carriers, we optimise logistics flows with CO2 reduction as a target. Agreements with carriers take into account C02 performance such as setting a maximum average emission factor for aircrafts. Balenciaga set up a warehouse close to its delivery points to avoid sending its products by air over long distances and gives priority to sea freight for orders that do not require urgent delivery. These actions will be continued in the next 10 years to contribute to Kering's target of reducing the intensity of supply chain–related emissions by 70% by 2030. 4) Results: In t.km, sea freight increased from 310% in 2019 to 16% in 2021, air freight decreased from 76% to 69% between 2019 and 2021. Regarding energy, Kering committed to obtain 100% of electricity from renewables by 2022 (RE100). Kering's commitment is to reduce absolute scope 1 & 2 GHG emissions by 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Regarding packaging, Kering pledged to eliminate single-use plastics from its B2C and B2B packaging by 2025 and 2030 respectively, with a view to reducing pollution and C02 emissions associated. (ii) Explanation of cost The annual budget of Kering sustainability department is 10€M, allocated between the various projects relating to the management and mitigation of identified risks and opportunities according to their level of importance and prioritization by the Group in line with the materiality matrix, which determines the number of projects implemented. Hence, the cost of response to the risk "Increase in direct costs associated with carbon pricing" is estimated around 2.5€M. This notably covers capital expenditures as well as operational expenditures such as management costs pertaining to the wages of Kering's experts working on carbon, energy, transport and packaging in support of logistics center of excellence (transport & packaging procurement cost).

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?
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
Renewable electricity sourcing is an opportunity for Kering as it could reduce Kering's direct costs linked to energy procurement, and reduce Kering's exposure to energy costs variations. The average cost of electricity is indeed 100€/ MWh in 2021 and coud increase by resp. 10-26% in a "Paris Ambition' scenario". In the other hand, cost of small scale corporate RE-PPA is expected to decrease by 27% in a 'Paris Ambition' scenario. Increasing the share of renewable energy is a real opportunity has the gap between conventional and RE-PPA price is continuously increasing and could reach -33% in a "Paris Ambition scenario". Kering commits to obtain 100% of electricity from renewable by 2022 (engaged with RE100). Approved by the Science Based Target initiative, Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. The targets are consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 1.5°C, the most ambitious goal of the Paris Agreement. In 2020 83% of the scope 1 and 2 target was achieved. In 2021, 92% of electricity consumed by Kering is generated using renewable resources (up 24 points versus 2018), contributing to the 70% decrease in our CO2 emissions linked to energy consumption since 2015. In Europe, 100% of the electricity consumed is generated using renewable resources. Kering has an expertise in renewable electricity thanks to its dedicated sustainability team and experts in renewable electricity and a high number of buildings that can be used to produce renewable electricity such as solar panels installed on the roofs of logistics hub, warehouses etc. The EU and worldwide market encourages Power Purchase Agreements especially when electricity is produced using already existing infrastructures such as rooftops. Hence Kering has a high opportunity to develop its production of renewable electricity.

Time horizon
Long-term

Likelihood
Likely

Magnitude of impact
Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
4000000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
6700000

Explanation of financial impact figure
A TCFD-aligned study was conducted by Kering with a specialised external and independent consultancy, to provide an initial estimate of the potential annual financial benefit on Kering's EBITDA of the renewable electricity sourcing by 2035. The financial range has been determined based on the following scenarios: - Low range: limited increase of electricity price in a no mitigation scenario (+4°C – RCP8.5), in which cost of electricity could increase between 10 and 26% by 2035 - High range: high increase of electricity price in a Paris ambition scenario (+1.5°C – RCP4.5), in which cost of small scale RE-PPA is expected to decrease by 27% by 2035 The assessment and approach are detailed below : 1) Focus on the top 10 countries accounting for more than 85% of Kering electricity consumption. 2) Estimate electricity expenses and gap between conventional and renewable: analysis showed that the cost of electricity (average cost in 2021: 100e/MWh) could increase by 10 to 26% in a scenario aligned with the Paris Agreement. 3) Analyze forecasted prices of renewable technologies by 2035: analysis showed that the cost of small scale corporate RE-PPA is expected to decrease by 27% in a scenario aligned with the Paris Agreement. 4) Estimate reduction in electricity procurement costs: based on this analysis, the gap between conventional and RE-PPA was estimated to reach 33% in a scenario aligned with the Paris Agreement. Based on this assessment, the annual financial benefits for Kering have been estimated to amount between €4M in a no mitigation scenario and €6.7M in a scenario aligned with the Paris Agreement, by 2035.

Cost to realize opportunity
11100000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
(i) Explanation of cost calculation figure The annual budget of Kering sustainability department is 10€M covering mainly OpEx and small CapEx for the operation of the department and its projects. Budget is allocated based on the level of importance and prioritization by the Group. in line with the materiality matrix. It is estimated that issue related to the resilience of kering supply chain takes up around 32% of the time/ ressource of the teams or around €3.2M, for sustainable sourcing projects. This notably covers CAPEX and OPEX such as management costs pertaining to the wages of experts dedicated to energy efficiency, as well as costs for the purchase of green certificates or investments required for emissions reduction initiatives (solar panels, LED...) Additional investments of €7.9M have been engaged over the last years by the brands to boost their reliance on renewable energy generated and used on site, for example by installing solar panels. In 2021, the photovoltaic power system was completed at the Group's main logistics hub in Trecate, Italy. The system has nominal capacity of 12.5 MW and is the biggest rooftop solar power system in Italy and one of the biggest in Europe. Total cost of management is estimated at €11.1M (3.2+7.9) (ii) Case study of company-specific activities Company-specific activities 1) Situation : energy sourcing is key for Kering to ensure the efficient operation of its 1969 sites. Kering aims to reduce its absolute scope 1 &2 GHG emissions reduction by 90% by 2030 from 2015 and source 100% of electricity from renewable by 2022 (RE100) 2)Task: Ensure reliable sourcing of renewable electricity for all of Kering's sites, reduce energy procurement costs 3)Action: Kering has a team of dedicated specialists on renewable electricity sourcing who are working on renewable electricity procurement of stores, offices, warehouses and industrial sites.In 2021, the photovoltaic power system was completed at the Group's main logistics hub in Trecate, Italy. This system would allow the Group to go from 4% to 15% energy self-production as production expected is 15,100 MWh/y. 4) Result: In 2021, Kering bought more than 130 GWh of unbundled Energy Attribute Certificates. In addition around 65 GWh of electricity came from Grid electricity consumption from a renewable source. In total, 92% of its electricity came from renewable source.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Does your organization's strategy include a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world?

Row 1

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

Publicly available transition plan
Yes

Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your transition plan
We do not have a feedback mechanism in place, but we plan to introduce one within the next two years

Description of feedback mechanism
<Not Applicable>

Frequency of feedback collection
<Not Applicable>

Attach any relevant documents which detail your transition plan (optional)
KERING_ClimateStrategy2021 def3.pdf

Explain why your organization does not have a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world and any plans to develop one in the future
<Not Applicable>

Explain why climate-related risks and opportunities have not influenced your strategy
<Not Applicable>

C3.2

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

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

C3.2a

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

Climate-related scenario	Scenario analysis coverage	Temperature alignment of scenario	Parameters, assumptions, analytical choices
Physical climate scenarios: RCP 4.5	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	Different physical (IPCC) and socio-economic (IEA) scenarios were considered for Kering climate-related analysis, with a 2035 timeframe. In line with TCFD recommendation scenarios were identified with external experts to explore different plausible and contrasting futures. Physical risks: the worst-case scenario (RCP 8.5) was selected to understand the impact of significant worsening of climatic conditions on Kering supply chain and compared to the most likely scenario (RCP4.5). All aspects of Kering strategy were considered in particular upstream value chain (impact of physical climate change and regulation on procurements) direct operation and downstream activities (including potential change in consumer expectation). Risk and opportunities were analysed with a 2035 time horizon. For example, for the risk "impacts of heat and water stress on leather costs and availability an analysis was performed for two IPCC scenarios with a 2035 timeframe : i) RCP4.5 or low carbon scenario (+1.5°C) ii) RCP8.5 or worst-case scenario (+4,5°C) A focus on beef leather for the most significant current/future sourcing areas was performed through the above analysis. In a worst-case scenario, it is expected that availability of cow/calf hide could decrease by 3% by 2035, leading to a likely price increase.
Physical climate scenarios: RCP 8.5	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	Different physical (IPCC) and socio-economic (IEA) scenarios were considered for Kering climate-related analysis, with a 2035 timeframe. In line with TCFD recommendation scenarios were identified with external experts to explore different plausible and contrasting futures. Physical risks: the worst-case scenario (RCP 8.5) was selected to understand the impact of significant worsening of climatic conditions on Kering supply chain and compared to the most likely scenario (RCP4.5). All aspects of Kering strategy were considered in particular upstream value chain (impact of physical climate change and regulation on procurements) direct operation and downstream activities (including potential change in consumer expectation). Risk and opportunities were analysed with a 2035 time horizon. For example, for the risk "impacts of heat and water stress on leather costs and availability an analysis was performed for two IPCC scenarios with a 2035 timeframe : i) RCP4.5 or low carbon scenario (+1.5°C) ii) RCP8.5 or worst-case scenario (+4,5°C) A focus on beef leather for the most significant current/future sourcing areas was performed through the above analysis. In a worst-case scenario, it is expected that availability of cow/calf hide could decrease by 3% by 2035, leading to a likely price increase.
Transition scenarios: IEA SDS	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	Different physical (IPCC) and socio-economic (IEA) scenarios were considered for Kering climate-related analysis, with a 2035 timeframe. In line with TCFD recommendation scenarios were identified with external experts to explore different plausible and contrasting futures. Transition risks : IEA SDS, SSP scenarios were considered to understand the impact of a strengthening of climate related regulation including carbon price on Kering – and compared to IEA CPS scenarios. Transition risk: For example, for the risk "Assessment of the financial impact of carbon pricing on energy procurement costs and carbon intensive goods & services", an analysis was performed of carbon price under scenarios consistent with experts modeling (IEA SDS & CPS, REMIND, MESSAGE GLOBIOM…) with a 2035 timeframe : Under a 1.5°C scenario carbon price could reach €75 in OECD countries with material impacts on the cost Kering logistics.
Transition scenarios: IEA CPS	Company-wide	<Not Applicable>	Different physical (IPCC) and socio-economic (IEA) scenarios were considered for Kering climate-related analysis, with a 2035 timeframe. In line with TCFD recommendation scenarios were identified with external experts to explore different plausible and contrasting futures. Transition risks : IEA SDS, scenarios were considered to understand the impact of a strengthening of climate related regulation including carbon price on Kering – and compared to IEA CPS scenarios. Based on the results, dedicated workshops have been held with multiple internal stakeholders from different departments (finance, sourcing, manufacturing, marketing, etc…). Some COMEX members have been involved and we have already accelerated our processes, such as SBTi roadmaps, to take into account the results of these studies. Indeed, it has been key to accelerate Kering's climate strategy that led to the group's decision to reinforce our SBT and adopt SBT1.5°C targets. Transition risk: For example, for the risk "Assessment of the financial impact of carbon pricing on energy procurement costs and carbon intensive goods & services", an analysis was performed of carbon price under scenarios consistent with experts modeling (IEA SDS & CPS, REMIND, MESSAGE GLOBIOM…) with a 2035 timeframe : Under a 1.5°C scenario carbon price could reach €75 in OECD countries with material impacts on the cost Kering logistics.

C3.2b

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

Row 1

Focal questions

Physical risks: What is the impact of significant worsening of climate conditions on Kering supply chain and compared to the most likely scenario (RCP4.5)? Transition risks : What is the impact of the strengthening of climate-related regulation including carbon price on Kering?

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

In order to answer the two focal questions, Kering conducted a TCFD-aligned study with a specialised external and independent consultancy to provide an initial estimate of the potential impact of climate-related risks to Kering and its supply chain activities. Based on the RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios for physical risks and IEA SDS and IEA CPS for transition risks, the analysis resulted on a mapping of Kering's supply chain's exposure to climate-related risks and an estimation of Kering's OpEx losses by regions for physical risks, and a mapping of climate-related regulations which are relevant for Kering's activities with a focus on carbon price. Results are described below: Physical risks: Climate-related scenario analysis showed that the growing frequency of heat stress or extreme events (droughts, flooding) could have a direct impact on the availability and quality of key raw materials including leather by 2035 (long term horizon), which would translate into greater price volatility, and thus affect the production and distribution of finished products. Hence, Kering takes into account this physical risk in its leather sourcing strategy, by favoring regions less vulnerable to climate-stress. Leather is now sourced mainly in Europe, which is less intensive in terms of cattle rearing. In 2021, 13% of leather was sourced in France, 11% in the Netherlands, 11% in Italy, 7% in the UK and 8% in Spain. Moreover, Kering develops new business models : developing alternatives to leather and the transition to a circular model which promotes the upcycling of leather leftovers. Understanding its risk on leather has influenced Kering's strategy as leather is a key raw material representing 71% of Kering's revenue. Transition risk: Climate-related scenario analysis showed that under a 1.5°C scenario carbon price could reach €75 in OECD countries with material impacts on the cost of Kering logistics. Indeed for Tier 0, more than 80% of Kering's GHG are due to logistics, 20% to energy. Kering is a French company that operates in a context on a strengthening carbon mechanisms, especially for transport.

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	(i) Description of how strategy in this area has been influenced with reference to the time horizon: strategic answers to risks identified are planned in a medium-term time horizon. Understanding its physical risks on leather has influenced Kering's strategy as leather is a key raw material for our main segments of products – leather goods and shoes – representing 71% of Kering's revenue. The growing frequency of heat stress or extreme events (droughts, flooding) could have a direct impact on the availability and quality of key raw materials including leather by 2035 (long term horizon), which would translate into greater price volatility, and thus affect the production and distribution of finished products. Hence, Kering takes into account this physical risk in its leather sourcing strategy, by favoring regions less vulnerable to climate-stress. Leather is now sourced mainly in Europe, which is less intensive in terms of cattle rearing. In 2021, 13% of leather was sourced in France, 11% in the Netherlands, 11% in Italy, 7% in the UK and 8% in Spain. Moreover, Kering develops new business models : developing alternatives to leather and the transition to a circular model which promotes the upcycling of leather leftovers (ii) Case study of a substantial strategic decision made S: Understanding its risk on leather has influenced Kering's strategy as leather is a key raw material representing 71% of Kering's revenue. T: The only way that Kering can mitigate the risks associated with environmental impacts on leather is to have traceability of leather in its supply chains. A: The Group has taken the substantial decision to reorient its leather sourcing strategy. To ensure traceability and compliance with Kering Standards, the following tools have been deployed: - Internal procedure for monitoring animal welfare in its leather supply chain - Supplier portal (Vendor Rating System) with questionnaires and CSR performance indicators : minimum requirements for leather suppliers include promoting the ecological sustainability of livestock production methods and avoiding the degradation and destruction of natural ecosystems. These actions help support suppliers to improve their resilience against heat stress. - Suppliers audits R: Traceability for leather (to the slaughterhouse) was achieved for 93% as of 2021.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	(i) Description of how strategy in this area has been influenced with reference to the time horizon : strategic answers to risks identified are planned in a medium-term time horizon. Understanding the risk of carbon pricing for Kering by 2035 (long term) has influenced Kering's strategy. The 2021 EP&L results show that GHG are mostly in Tiers 1 to 4 (from production of raw materials to their assembly). For Tier 0, more than 80% of Kering's GHG are due to logistics, 20% to energy. Kering is a French company that operates in a context on a strengthening carbon mechanisms, especially for transport. Coverage of logistics-related GHG emissions could reach 80-90% by 2035. The introduction of a carbon tax related to energy, logistics and packaging would imply significant business and operational impacts for Kering, through an increase of Kering's costs related to the purchase of goods and services. Hence, Kering takes into account this transition risk in its strategy by reducing its Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions in line with its SBTs. (ii) Case study of a substantial strategic decision made S: 80% of Kering's emissions occurs in regions with carbon pricing mechanisms. T&A: To mitigate our risk of increasing procurement costs, Kering has taken the substantial decision to reorient its purchasing strategy : -Setting up a team of specialists on transport and energy procurement to build new logistics schemes such as increasing sea freight, reducing distances covered during goods' supply and delivery, improving truck load factors and truck fleets' performance, developing alternative means of transport.. -Sustainable sourcing based on EP&L results and alignment to the requirements of the Kering Standards for raw materials, that include a pillar on environmental performance -Engaging with our suppliers to encourage them to design and implement GHG mitigation action plans R: -From 2019 to 2021, in terms of t/km, sea freight increased from 10% to 15%, air freight decreased from 76% to 69% -Kering is sourcing more that 60% of its leather from European countries (compared to Brazil or Argentina), thus reducing B2B transportation CO2 emissions. This contributes to achieving 2 of Kering's main targets (vs 2015 baseline): reduce EP&L by 40%, and scope 3 GHG emissions by 70% per unit of value added in line with the Group's SBT.
Investment in R&D	Yes	(i) Description of how strategy in this area has been influenced with reference to the time horizon: strategic answers to risks identified are planned in a medium-term time horizon. Understanding physical risks on Kering's strategic materials by 2035 (long term) has influenced Kering's strategy. Raw materials are mainly sourced from agricultural sources (leather,wool...) that could be affected by climate change due to risks such as heat stress and water scarcity, impacting cow leather or wool availability. To manage these risks, Kering continuously brings innovation that support the transition to a lower-carbon, energy-efficient economy to its products. This is integrated into our R&D strategy and embedded in the "create new business models" pillar of our 2025 strategy. It is also strongly connected to our sustainable sourcing strategy, building on the results of the EP&L that allows us to assess the raw materials used in product design and orient the Group towards sustainable sourcing solutions. Kering and its Houses are implementing initiatives to foster sustainable innovation at all level of production processes and value chain. (ii) Case study S : Kering relies on strategic raw materials which may be vulnerable to climate change T&A: Kering works to develop innovative materials, with lower environmental impact and increased resilience to climate change. For example, Kering partnered with Fashion for Good to accelerate innovation in the fashion industry by factoring in sustainability criteria and supporting the development of start-ups through an intensive accelerator program providing support for more than 115 innovators. The accent is placed on technologies that can help players in the textile industry reduce their consumption of water and energy, their waste production and their use of chemicals, and help improve their working methods, focusing on 3 priority areas: the supply of raw materials, the manufacture of fabrics and garments (dyeing, processing...) and product end-of-life (circular economy). R: Kering approached 61% of start-ups to discuss a range of innovations, such as eco-friendly dyes and alternatives to leather, polyester etc.., and other materials which could be less vulnerable to climate change. Of the 83 pilot projects launched via the accelerator, 18 were coordinated with Kering Houses through the Materials Innovation Lab for fabrics.
Operations	Yes	(i) Description of how strategy in this area has been influenced with reference to the time horizon : strategic answers to risks identified are planned in a medium-term time horizon. Understanding the risks linked to energy sourcing by 2035 (long-term) has influenced Kering's strategy. Kering could be affected by carbon pricing linked to its energy-related Scope 1 & 2 GHG, and could be affected by increased electricity expenses. Indeed, cost of electricity average is 100€/ MWh in 2021 and could increase by 10-26% in a Paris Ambition scenario. In order to reduce its exposure to energy price variations, and as energy prices are already affecting Kering, the Group is implementing a series of energy efficiency measures in its operations. In particular, it has influenced Kering's climate strategy and the 'Care for the environment' pillar of its 2025 sustainability strategy: Kering committed in 2016/2017 to reduce the environmental footprint of its entire value chain – including its operations - sites by 40% by 2025 (2015 baseline, based on EP&L intensity), and is committed to reduce its absolute GHG emissions in scopes 1 & 2 by 90% by 2030, from a 2015 base year. This target covering GHG emissions from Kering's operations (scopes 1 & 2) is consistent with reductions required to keep global warming to 1.5°C. Furthermore, Kering has committed to increase its annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. We are taking a two-pronged approach: the Group improves its energy efficiency (such as solar panels, LED technology deployment in buildings, certifications) and uses renewable energy, notably through the development of PPAs. (ii) Case study of a substantial strategic decision made S : Kering could be affected by carbon pricing linked to its energy-related Scope 1 & 2 GHG T&A : The most substantial strategic decision made in this area to date is the decision to significantly shift towards electricity from renewable sources, thanks to sizable purchases of renewable energy certificates in 43 countries. R: in 2021, 92% of electricity consumed was generated using renewable resources, contributing to the 70% decrease in C02 emissions linked to energy consumption since 2015

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	1. Direct cost (i) Description of the climate-related risk: The risk “Increase in direct costs associated with carbon pricing” has been assessed to be a material, through the assessment of Kering’s carbon hotpots (such as direct emissions, logistics and packaging). (ii) Case study of how this climate-related risk has influenced financial planning This risk has influenced financial planning through the decision to offset GHG emissions and become carbon neutral. Indeed, on top of efforts already made by the Group in recent years to reduce its carbon footprint and energy consumption (and therefore exposure to energy prices), Kering took a further step in 2019 by deciding to offset not only the GHG emissions falling into Scopes 1 and 2 of the GHG Protocol, as has been the case since 2011, but also all remaining annual Scope 3 emissions within its own operations and in its supply chains. The carbon offsetting (in 2021 in respect of 2020 CO2 emissions) of all of the Group’s activities (Scopes 1 and 2 and part of Scope 3) and its supply chain (Scope 3), representing a total of 1,779,888 TCO2 via REDD+ certified projects, protects and restores sensitive ecosystems (forests, wetlands, coastal areas) as well as supporting green energy generation projects. This decision led to the integration of related costs in the Group’s financial provisions and yearly planning. (iii) Time horizon covered by the financial planning As the Group has committed to carbon neutrality, impact is annual going forwards and without an end year. 2. Direct costs (i) Description of the climate-related risk: The risk “impact of heat stress on cow/calf leather availability” has been assessed to be a material, through the assessment of Kering’s carbon hotpots. As part of its 2025 sustainability strategy (2015 baseline), Kering has set ambitious goals including on sustainable sourcing of raw materials through the achievement of 2 targets: achieving 100% traceability of key raw materials and 100% alignment with the Kering Standards for raw materials and manufacturing processes. These Standards set out the criteria imposed on the Group and its suppliers in five key areas: traceability, use of chemicals, social impact, environmental impact and animal welfare. These Standards will help Kering reduce the environmental impacts throughout its value chain, including its scope 3 carbon footprint and also become more resilient to climate change in the future. (ii) A case study of how this climate-related risk has been considered into financial planning is the direct costs associated with the sourcing of raw materials compliant with Kering Standards. The average price increase on all textile fibres when Kering Standard compliant (such as organic cotton yarns/fabrics GOTS certified compared to conventional cotton) would be 10-15%. Certified fibers with very high quality and limited quantities, such as Supima Extra Long Staple American cotton and extra fine Australian Merino wool can have higher price increases like 40 or 50%. For main textile fibres, the % of material already compliant with Kering Standards in 2021 are : 37% for wool, 43% for cashmere, 66% for cotton, 25% for silk, 78% for cellulosics, 31% for nylon, 28% for polyester. (iii) time horizon covered by the financial planning The time horizon for the impact on financial planning is annual

C3.5

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

Yes

C3.5a

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

Financial Metric

CAPEX

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

61

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

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

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

It should be noted that, for Kering, the GHG emissions targeted by the Taxonomy regulation under the first two climate objectives only concern buildings and, as a result, account for less than 20% of Kering’s total GHG emissions (scopes 1, 2 and 3 of the Group’s operations). The Group is acting more broadly to reduce its carbon footprint across all sources of emissions (scopes 1, 2 and 3). Over and above the "Taxonomy Capex" and "Taxonomy Opex" categories, as defined in the climate objectives of the European regulation, Kering seeks to optimize the energy efficiency of its own operations and, going further, to minimize its environmental footprint through investment meeting best practice and the most demanding standards and certification requirements. The main actions taken by the Group within its own operations and in its supply chains Eligible "Taxonomy Capex" = 2,220 €M. It represents 61% of Kering’s Total "Taxonomy Capex" (denominator). Eligible items related mainly to the increase in rights-of-use assets under store leases. The Taxonomy requires the inclusion of all lease right-of-use assets both in the denominator (Total Capex) and the numerator (Eligible Capex) of the Capex indicator. These rights-of-use assets correspond to the present value of future rent payments that the Group undertook when signing a real estate lease. As a result, the values presented do not represent a tangible investment by the Group in an underlying real estate asset as this remains entirely the property of the lessor. In addition, eligible "Taxonomy Capex" includes, under the heading of property, plant and equipment, other investment expenditure relating to the energy efficiency of our stores, warehouses and offices. Analysis of the Group’s intangible assets, notably investment in software, did not identify any investment eligible for the Taxonomy.

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

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

Absolute target

Intensity 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
2015

Target coverage
Company-wide

Scope(s)
Scope 1
Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method
Market-based

Scope 3 category(ies)
<Not Applicable>

Base year
2015

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
12711

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
87923

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)
100635

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1
100

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2
100

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)
<Not Applicable>

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes
100

Target year
2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
90

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]
10063.5

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
19281

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
11227

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)
30508

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
77.427226003765

Target status in reporting year
Revised

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

Target ambition
1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
Kering was the first Luxury company and the first French based company to have its GHG target approved by the Science Based Target Initiative. See http://sciencebasedtargets.org/2016/12/14/global-luxury-group-kering-commits-to-industry-and-country-leading-carbon-reduction-targets/ Kering updated its Science Based Target (SBT) in 2021 to align it with the 1.5°C scenario. This revised target was approved by the SBTi in April 2021. Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action This target is covering 100% of the Group's scope 1 & 2 emissions.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year
Between 2015 and 2021, GHGs emissions related to scope 1&2 have already decreased by 70%. Kering is therefore well advance in progressing towards its 1.5°C aligned target. The strategy implemented by the Group to reach this target is twofold: 1. Increasing energy efficiency at site level: at the level of the Group's operations (Tier 0 in the EP&L), the Kering's carbon intensity (€EP&L/k€ in revenue) declined by 35.5% between 2015 and 2021. This progress is notably the product of the energy efficiency measures undertaken at stores, offices and industrial sites by Kering and its Houses. This is mainly done through systematically obtaining recognized, high-level certification for new sites renovated by Kering. and establishing a Group-wide standard for stores. 2. Favoring renewable energy by producing it on site or purchasing renewable energy certificates. Electricity consumption is 100% renewable in 43 countries and regions (Europe, Americas, South Africa and a large part of Asia). At Group

level, this represents 92% in 2021 compared to 24% in 2015.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target
<Not Applicable>

C4.1b

(C4.1b) Provide details of your emissions intensity target(s) and progress made against those target(s).

Target reference number
Int 1

Year target was set
2015

Target coverage
Company-wide

Scope(s)
Scope 3

Scope 2 accounting method
<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 category(ies)
Category 1: Purchased goods and services
Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
Category 6: Business travel

Intensity metric
Other, please specify (Metric tons CO2 per unit of value added in euros (consolidated gross margin))

Base year
2015

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
<Not Applicable>

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
<Not Applicable>

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
305.8

Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
305.8

% of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure
<Not Applicable>

% of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure
<Not Applicable>

% of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this Scope 3 intensity figure
90

% of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure
90

Target year
2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
70

Intensity figure in target year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity) [auto-calculated]
91.74

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions
46

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
<Not Applicable>

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
<Not Applicable>

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
161.7

Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)
161.7

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
67.3175745118191

Target status in reporting year
Revised

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

Target ambition
1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
Kering was the first Luxury company and the first French based company to have its GHG target approved by the Science Based Target Initiative. See http://sciencebasedtargets.org/2016/12/14/global-luxury-group-kering-commits-to-industry-and-country-leading-carbon-reduction-targets/ Kering updated its Science Based Target (SBT) in 2021 to align it with the 1.5°C scenario. This revised target was approved by the SBTi in April 2021. Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. Kering commits to increase annual sourcing of renewable electricity from 25% in 2015 to 100% by 2022. Kering commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions 70% per unit of value added by 2030 from a 2015 base year. https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-actionKering updated its Science Based Target (SBT) in 2020 to align it with the 1.5°C scenario. This scope 3 target is covering more than 90% of total scope 3 emissions. Emissions related to the use and end of life of product are excluded from this target as they have been measured only starting from 2020. The scope 3 CO2 emissions in 2015 was 1 470 814 TCO2e. The consolidated gross margin in 2015 was 4 810 M€. Thus the intensity is 305.8 TCO2/M€ (=1 470 814 TCO2e / 4 810 M€). The scope 3 CO2 emissions in 2021 was 2 112 957 TCO2e. The consolidated gross margin in 2021 was 13 068 M€. Thus the intensity is of 161.7 TCO2/M€ (=2 112 957 TCO2e / 13 068 M€).

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year
Between 2015 and 2021, GHGs intensity related to scope 3 have already decreased by 47%. Kering is therefore on track towards its 1.5°C aligned target. As approximately 80% of scope 3 GHGs emissions are associated with purchased goods and services, the main strategy implemented by Kering to reach this scope 3 target is focused on raw material used and supply chain impacts. Leather representing 71% of Kering revenue, it is the most used material across the Group, it is also responsible for 50% of total scope 3 GHG emissions. One of the key priority of the Group is therefore to optimize the use of leather and work on more responsible sourcing at the same time. As a result, the usage of leather per € turnover has decreased by 100% between 2015 and 2021. On top of that, most of the leather used by the Group in 2021 is coming from Europe with reduce carbon footprint. This approach is not limited to leather but is covering also carbon intensive materials such as cashmere, wool or metals. This ambition is supported by the implementation of the Kering Standards. It sets out the criteria imposed on the Group in five key areas: traceability, use of chemicals, social impact, environmental impact and animal welfare, describing the minimum requirements for Group suppliers in each of these five areas, as well as the more demanding requirements that suppliers will have to meet by 2025. They are based on founding notions of integrity (traceability, chain of custody certification, etc.), circularity (use of recycled materials, recyclability of products, etc.) and the precautionary principle (no use of GMOs, no nano-materials, etc.). The Kering Standards cover: • key raw materials used by the Group, representing more than 95% of purchasing volumes, namely leather and precious skins, fur alternatives, wool, cashmere, cotton, silk, synthetic fibers, paper, wood, plastic, feathers and down, cellulosic fibers, gold, diamonds, colored gemstones and silver; • main production processes, namely tanning, the various stages of textile manufacture, leather work and shoes; • since 2020: packaging, visual tools and innovation for sustainable production; • since 2021: logistics (warehousing and transportation) and rules for managing products at the end of their lifecycle). In 2021, 71% of raw materials were aligned with the Kering Standards. The goal is to reach 100% by 2025.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target
<Not Applicable>

C4.2

(C4.2) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?
Target(s) to increase low-carbon energy consumption or production
Net-zero target(s)

C4.2a

(C4.2a) Provide details of your target(s) to increase low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Target reference number
Low 1

Year target was set
2019

Target coverage
Company-wide

Target type: energy carrier
Electricity

Target type: activity
Consumption

Target type: energy source
Renewable energy source(s) only

Base year
2015

Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)
332663

% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year
24.5

Target year
2022

% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in target year
100

% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year
92

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
89.4039735099338

Target status in reporting year
Underway

Is this target part of an emissions target?
The Group targets to achieve 100% renewable electricity by 2022. This target is contributing to the 1.5°C aligned GHGs absolute emissions reduction target (Abs 1) for scope 1 & 2. Kering commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action Beyond pure EACs and offsets purchase, the strategy considers: - Improving energy efficiency at the Group's premises: energy efficiency is the lowest impact energy source. Through the issuance and implementation of guidelines and standards for sustainable stores and buildings design and for efficient facility management, the Group plans to reduce energy intensity by more than 50% from 2015 to 2025 and further beyond. This will compensate the important growth trend expected by Kering. - Pursuing self-production of clean energy: today the Group self-produces about 2% of its consumption through rooftop solar systems. As the largest part of the Group's sites are stores, the Group will never be able to cover relevant portions of consumption through self-production. However, headquarters and warehouses have large roof surfaces available. In 2019 the Group started the construction of its new main logistic centre in Italy, which is hosting the largest rooftop solar systems in Europe, producing more energy than the site uses and feeding the Group's Italian stores through the grid. The systematic installation of rooftop solar systems on warehouses and headquarters will allow the group to achieve a 10-15% coverage with self-production by 2030. - Pursuing additionality in renewable energy purchases: pushing energy transition means stimulating the increase of the renewable energy production share. In this sense, the Group has started exploring the purchase of energy through medium-term virtual and physical Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) and plans, at regime, to source at least half of the electricity through such arrangements, that proved to be the most effective drivers of renewable energy growth in countries with liberalized markets. Besides, the option of buying shares of new renewable power plants is being considered. In 2021, 92% of electricity consumed is generated using renewable resources, contributing to the 70% decrease in our CO2 emissions linked to energy consumption since 2015.

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?
RE100

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
The Group targets to achieve 100% renewable electricity by 2022. This target is designed to cover 100% of Kering's activities and sites without any exclusions.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year
In 2020, the Group jointed the RE100 initiative led by the Climate Group and the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). As part of this initiative, Kering has pledged to use 100% renewable electricity by 2022. The RE100 target will be achieved purchasing EACs for 100% of the Group's consumption in all countries where an EACs system is in place. For countries with no EACs system in place, but with grid connection with countries having an EACs system in place, this will be obtained through EACs purchase from the neighbouring countries (European GOs for Russia, UAE GOs for Gulf States) and, partially, through PPAs if and where possible. In the remaining countries (especially Korea, by far the most important one), Kering will explore the possibility of purchasing new renewable power plants capacity generating amounts of electricity comparable to its local consumption. Beyond pure EACs and offsets purchase, the strategy considers also: - Improving energy efficiency at the Group's premises - Pursuing self-production of clean energy - Pursuing additionality in renewable energy purchases Each year, the proportion of electricity from renewable sources used by the Group increases, reaching 92% in 2021 thanks to increased on-site production of renewable energy and the numerous green energy contracts implemented by the brands with the Group's support. As a result, Electricity consumption is 100% renewable in 43 countries and regions (Europe, Americas, South Africa and a large part of Asia). As regards the Houses, Brioni, Qeelin and Girard-Perregaux now use 100% renewable electricity. For all Gucci sites, the share of renewable electricity reached 93% in 2021. It was 83.7% for Bottega Veneta, 86.7% for Balenciaga, 92.6% for Saint Laurent, 95.5% for Alexander McQueen, 95.6% for Boucheron and 99.3% for Kering Eyewear. The Group's energy structure is dominated by electricity use. A small share (about 10%) of natural gas and other fossil fuels are used at the premises of Kering sites. In order to achieve a 100% renewable target, the guidelines and standards push for the total electrification of all new sites. Where the use of natural gas will remain necessary, the use of green gas certificates will be pursued. The target is to eliminate fossil fuels use or use biogas (directly or through gas certificates) by 2030.

List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target
<Not Applicable>

C4.2c

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

Target reference number
NZ1

Target coverage
Company-wide

Absolute/intensity emission target(s) linked to this net-zero target
Abs1
Int1

Target year for achieving net zero
2050

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and we have committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative in the next 2 years

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
As part of its Climate Strategy published in 2021, Kering commits to to a 1.5°C pathway and net zero by 2050, underlining its ambitions in sustainability, circularity and biodiversity. Kering's Climate Strategy endeavors to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 in accordance with our SBTi commitment and ongoing support of Natural Climate Solutions. Key highlights of our Climate Strategy include: • Achieving a 1.5°C pathway and net zero by 2050 • Reaching a 90% absolute reduction of Scopes 1&2 GHG emissions by 2030 from a 2015 baseline • 70% reduction (per unit value added) of Scope 3 GHG emissions by 2030 • Increasing direct sourcing of renewable electricity to reach 100% by 2022 • Strategic and appropriate offsetting through NCS for 'hard to abate' emissions These targets are covering 100% of Kering activities. Furthermore, Kering's NCS actions go beyond our direct supply chains and also underpin our offsetting approach. While continuing to prioritize emissions reductions and supporting NCS within our supply chain, Kering has also been offsetting 'hard to abate' emissions through robust REDD+ programs around the world for a decade. Initially, this focused primarily on emissions in Scopes 1 and 2, but now has broadened to include Scope 3. Offsetting will continue with REDD+ at its core, but with a broader portfolio of programs including verified carbon credits through 'blue carbon' and 'agriculture-based carbon'
https://keringcorporate.dam.kering.com/m/3832efa4c93e4a96/original/KERING_ClimateStrategy2021.pdf

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

Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at target year
Kering's Climate Strategy endeavors to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 in accordance with our SBTi commitment and ongoing support of Natural Climate Solutions. Key highlights of our Climate Strategy include: • Achieving a 1.5°C pathway and net zero by 2050 • Reaching a 90% absolute reduction of Scopes 1&2 GHG emissions by 2030 from a 2015 baseline • 70% reduction (per unit value added) of Scope 3 GHG emissions by 2030 • Increasing direct sourcing of renewable electricity to reach 100% by 2022 • Strategic and appropriate offsetting through NCS for 'hard to abate' emissions Kering has been supporting offsetting programs since 2012 via REDD+ projects. The carbon offsetting (in 2021 in respect of 2020 CO2 emissions) of all of the Group's activities (Scopes 1 and 2 and part of Scope 3) and its supply chain (Scope 3), representing a total of 1,779,888 TCO2 via REDD+ certified projects, protects and restores sensitive ecosystems (forests, wetlands, coastal areas) as well as supporting green energy generation projects. In addition, Kering is continuing to diversity its carbon offsetting approach to include other natural climate solutions, such as regenerative farming practices that enhance carbon sequestration and mangrove restoration. Since 2020, Kering has also invested in Low Carbon Label projects, in partnership with IDELE (Institut de l'Élevage), which support French cattle breeders in developing more carbon efficient practices.

Planned actions to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain (optional)
From cotton to wool, or leather to cashmere, most clothing begins life as a raw material on a farm or rangeland. For this reason, the future of the fashion industry is inextricably linked with the future of agriculture. Though agriculture is currently a major driver of biodiversity loss and climate change, it can be transformed from a 'problem' to a powerful nature-based solution. To achieve this transformation, Kering and Conservation International launched the Regenerative Fund for Nature, with the aim of transforming 1,000,000 hectares of crop and rangelands into regenerative agricultural spaces over the next five years. In practice, the Fund will provide grants to farming groups, project leaders, NGOs and other stakeholders who are ready to test, prove and scale regenerative practices, which focus on working in harmony with natural systems. The 2021 cohort is a diverse and powerful inaugural portfolio andstands out for the innovative approaches showcased by each initiative. Overall, the projects represent 840,000 hectares which will ultimately be transformed into regenerative agricultural spaces, engaging 60,000 people around the globe.

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	0	0
To be implemented*	0	0
Implementation commenced*	0	0
Implemented*	2	4644
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

Low-carbon energy generation	Solar PV

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
2411

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur
Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
578640

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
7890545

Payback period
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
21-30 years

Comment
On top of external purchases, the brands have been boosting their reliance on renewable energy generated and used on site, for example by installing solar panels. Some Houses have already installed solar equipment on the roofs of their buildings, whether stores or workshops, such as Saint Laurent, Brioni and three Bottega Veneta sites in Italy. The solar panels supply between 2% and 4% of each site's power needs. In 2020, Gucci installed solar panels at two of its Italian headquarters, in Milan and Florence, enabling them use to green electricity on site. The plant in Sucy-en-Brie, France, also uses renewables, primarily geothermal and solar power, thanks to solar panels and heat transfer fluids. The LEED-certified warehouse in Vescovana, Italy, has also been fitted with solar panels, representing 15 kW of power. In 2021, the photovoltaic power system was completed at the Group's main logistics hub in Trecate, Italy. The system has nominal capacity of 12.5 MW and is the biggest rooftop solar power system in Italy and one of the biggest in Europe. Tests are being conducted and it will be connected to the grid in early 2022, increasing the proportion of energy generated within the Group from 4% to 15%. A further three logistics warehouses also have panels in Switzerland, the United States and Dubai.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings	Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
2233

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur
Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Mandatory

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
535943

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
558274

Payback period
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
11-15 years

Comment
LED technology – a source of significant energy savings (up to 90% on lighting) – continued to be rolled out by all of the Group's Houses, with close to 100% deployment in store sales areas, where the most light fittings are concentrated. In 2020 and 2021, efforts were focused on introducing LED lighting into store backrooms, offices, warehouses and production plants. This practice is part of the Kering Standards and also a criterion for obtaining environmental certifications such as LEED, BREEAM and HQE. Some Houses are also gradually rolling out site energy consumption management tools (Building Management System for 45 Gucci stores, dedicated digital system at Saint Laurent) at their stores in order to make them more energy efficient (heating and air conditioning, ventilation, lighting, etc.).

C4.3c

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

Method	Comment
Internal price on carbon	Kering developed the EP&L to help measure and understand its impact on natural capital across the supply chain, from raw materials to the delivery of products to the customers. The E P&L is a tool designed to measure and monitor the costs of environmental changes associated with business. It is based on economic analysis that estimates societal costs of environmental impacts, including putting a price on carbon. The EP&L deepens our understanding of the relative significance of different types of impacts, as well as the drivers of those impacts. Quantifying and valuing all impacts in monetary terms enables trade-offs to be considered across types of impact, locations, materials, processes, products and technologies. This ultimately helps us prioritize our actions and drive investments towards environmental impact reduction activities including carbon footprint reduction projects. The approach draws on the best of existing scientific and economic literature to derive an estimate of the societal costs associated with climate change. The core of the methodology revolves around identifying an appropriate estimate for the societal cost of carbon. To do this the average across existing studies, selected based on a set of predefined criteria is used. Following this approach, in 2019, we have determined an internal price of 73.5€ per Tonnes of CO2e. In 2020, valuation coefficients were upated. This resulted in an average increase of 15% across the different impact indicators. The ton of CO2e has risen to €86.4 per ton of CO2e since then. This value was also used for 2021 EP&L calculation.
Financial optimization calculations	The Environmental Profit & Loss Account is an innovative tool to measure the environmental footprint across our entire supply chain and then calculate the monetary value of the footprint as a common basis of comparison. An EP&L analysis provides us with information we would otherwise not have incorporated into our planning. By looking at our entire footprint (including carbon footprint), it helps us understand and identify opportunities to measure and better manage our environmental impacts. By stating these impacts in monetary terms, it enables us to have a common metric to compare performance across different product categories and business units.
Dedicated budget for energy efficiency	An important impact of Kering activities on the environment is related to renovating and operating the more than 1900 stores around the world. There is where we have the most lever to decrease direct energy use and direct waste production for instance. To support this ambition, Kering has been working since 2017 to develop a “Standard for Stores” that sets out expected performance levels in 11 key areas. These include energy management, lighting, renewable energy, water use and waste treatment. The Standards cover all phases in a building’s lifecycle, namely site selection and relations with the lessor, design, construction or renovation, and operation. After a test phase at the Group’s stores, the standard was officially published in 2020 to serve as a reference for new stores and store renovations where the use of LEED or equivalent certifications is not possible. In 2021, particular effort was made to verify alignment with these standards for 22 stores in France and 12 in the United Kingdom.
Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D	Kering’s EPL clearly shows that most environmental impacts (74%) are caused upstream of the supply chain by raw material extraction and production and the initial transformation stage (Tiers 3 and 4). For Kering, critical impacts are generated by the raw materials used in large quantities whose production can significantly impact the environment (leather, cotton, synthetic fibres, etc.), or by raw materials used in small quantities but whose extraction or production can have a high impact. This is the case for animal fibres such as wool, cashmere and silk, and for metals and precious stones (gold and diamonds). Kering has committed to reducing its environmental footprint in the pre-operations phase, starting with the production of its raw materials. To this end, the Smart Sourcing program, launched in 2013, provides recommendations and guidance for brands, allowing them to use raw materials produced sustainably and responsibly. This project involves the Material Innovation Lab and supply chain management, R&D and sustainability teams working closely with the Group and its brands to come up with responsible sourcing solutions tailored to the specific needs of each brand. As the Group’s sustainability strategy entered a new phase, in 2016 the guidelines were restructured into the Kering Standards, which give fuller details on material and process requirements. The new Kering Standards specify criteria to be met by the Group and its suppliers on five main points: traceability, chemicals, social impact, environmental impact and animal welfare. They cover leather, precious skins, fur, cashmere, wool, cotton, paper, wood, plastics, gold, diamonds, cellulose based fibres, feathers and down. Kering Standards have also been drawn up for the Group’s main production processes: tanning, textile manufacture stages and leather work. In the open source approach that has prevailed at Kering since the launch of its EPL initiative, the Kering Standards have been made public on Kering’s website in 2018. The 2020 update of the Standards included new sections on packaging, visual tools and innovation for sustainable production. The sections devoted to raw materials were enhanced, a review of the recommended certifications, and the creation of an “other raw materials” section covering materials that are less key for purchasing, but which have raised questions among the Houses.

C4.5

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

No

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

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

No

C5.1a

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

Row 1

Has there been a structural change?

Yes, an acquisition

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

Lindberg

Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

Kering Eyewear has completed the acquisition of the Danish Luxury Eyewear brand LINDBERG, in accordance with the terms announced on 8th July, 2021 and after having received clearance from the antitrust authorities. LINDBERG will be consolidated in Kering accounts starting from Q4 2021 onwards.

C5.1b

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

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

C5.1c

(C5.1c) Have your organization's base year emissions been recalculated as result of the changes or errors reported in C5.1a and C5.1b?

	Base year recalculation	Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold
Row 1	No, because the operations acquired or divested did not exist in the base year	Not applicable

C5.2

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

Scope 1

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
12711

Comment

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
114112

Comment

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
87923.15

Comment

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
1203934

Comment

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

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

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
26704

Comment

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
49008

Comment

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
19236

Comment

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
4

Comment

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
105567

Comment

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

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
3016

Comment

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

Base year start
January 1 2015

Base year end
December 31 2015

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

C5.3

(C5.3) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.
Bilan Carbone
Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019
IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion
ISO 14064-1
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
Other, please specify (IEA emission factors)

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)
19281

Start date
January 1 2021

End date
December 31 2021

Comment

Past year 1

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
14257

Start date
January 1 2020

End date
December 31 2020

Comment

Past year 2

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
16582

Start date
January 1 2019

End date
December 31 2019

Comment

Past year 3

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
14624

Start date
January 1 2018

End date
December 31 2018

Comment

C6.2

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

Row 1

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

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

Comment
The Scope 2 emission figures relating to electricity are obtained using market-based methodology, giving specific attention to the proportion of electricity from renewable sources. Details of the emission factors used are set out in the methodological note to Kering's 2021 environmental reporting on the Group's website. https://keringcorporate.dam.kering.com/m/48b1b5d3b7d9fa0f/original/Kering-Methodological-note-on-Environmental-reporting-FY21.pdf Scope 2 emissions figures using location-based approach are also calculated and reported within this questionnaire.

C6.3

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

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based
89242

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
11227

Start date
January 1 2021

End date
December 31 2021

Comment

Past year 1

Scope 2, location-based
106226

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
11271

Start date
January 1 2020

End date
December 31 2020

Comment

Past year 2

Scope 2, location-based
113831

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
19005

Start date
January 1 2019

End date
December 31 2019

Comment

Past year 3

Scope 2, location-based
104227

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
32448

Start date
January 1 2018

End date
December 31 2018

Comment

C6.4

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

No

C6.5

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

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1835091

Emissions calculation methodology

Hybrid method

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

21

Please explain

Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. In 2021, 13% of purchased goods and services emissions are calculated using suppliers or value chain partners.

Capital goods

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

Please explain

Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Kering's production and processing facilities mostly comprise workshops and warehouses and therefore do not represent significant capital immobilization. As such, we do not consider this source of Scope 3 CO2 emissions to be relevant as it represents less than 1% of the Global Scope 3.

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

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

28848

Emissions calculation methodology

Site-specific method

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

100

Please explain

Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. In 2021, 100% of Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2) are calculated using suppliers or value chain partners. These emissions are estimated using a site specific method with ad-hoc emissions factors.

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
163188

Emissions calculation methodology
Supplier-specific method
Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. In 2021, 100% of Upstream transportation and distribution are calculated using suppliers or value chain partners. These emissions are estimated using distance based and supplier specific approach. B2B transportation accounted for 66% of the Group's transportation-related emissions in 2021 (see p.216 of URD 2021) Kering uses road transportation to carry its products from workshops to distribution warehouses and from warehouses to outlets. Air transportation is also used frequently to move goods quickly to far-off destinations. In 2019, air freight represented 76.3% in terms of t/km of products, and decreased to 69.4% in 2021. In 2019, sea freight represented 9.8% in terms of t/km and increased to 15% in 2021. The figures show a significant increase between 2019 and 2021 in the use of sea and rail freight, which has a lower impact in terms of CO2 emissions. Emissions from air freight therefore remained at a similar level to 2019 despite an increase of nearly 10% in air transportation over the same period. These changes seen in the carbon impact of transportation is due to the return to a higher level of activity than that seen before the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the increase in lower carbon modes of transport between 2019 and 2021 – in particular sea and rail freight – limited the increase in total emissions related to BtoB transportation to +6.4% over the period.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. The EP&L includes a specific impact group to capture impact related to waste production. Considering the nature of waste produced by Kering activities, we do not consider this source of Scope 3 CO2 emissions to be relevant. This represents less than 1% of the Global Scope 3.

Business travel

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
12727

Emissions calculation methodology
Supplier-specific method
Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. In 2021, 100% of emissions related to business travel are calculated using suppliers or value chain partners. These emissions are estimated using distance based and supplier specific approach. New practices and ways of working were introduced due to the health restrictions in 2020. Working from home and widespread use of digital events are the main resources for the reduction in business travel. 2021 was also affected by the many restrictions in place, which impacted international flights in particular. The carbon footprint relating to business travel therefore decreased by 69% between 2019 and 2021. To limit the impact of travel by the employees of Kering and its Houses on the Group's carbon footprint, the Group has incorporated environmental criteria into the selection of company cars and is gradually increasing the number of electric vehicles in its fleet. As a result, electric and hybrid vehicles account for more than 50% of Gucci's corporate fleet, and charging points are provided at all sites. Bottega Veneta is also pursuing the renewal of its fleet with the inclusion of hybrid and electric vehicles, which made up 46% of the fleet at the end of 2021 (77 vehicles). Pomellato, Dodo and Kering Eyewear are also including hybrid and electric vehicles in their fleets. Kering Corporate offers rechargeable hybrid vehicles and fully electric vehicles in each car category. The Group's Houses are also developing alternatives to reduce work-related travel and encouraging employees to use public transport and green modes of transport, as well as car pooling.

Employee commuting

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Kering employs around 42,000 people, mostly sales personnel living and working in cities. Employee commuting does not represent a material source of Scope 3 emissions (less than 1%), especially compared to the Scope 3 emissions linked to agricultural activities or transformation industries within Kering's supply chain for leather or fabric production (which are evaluated through Kering's EP&L). As such, we do not consider this source of Scope 3 CO2 emissions to be relevant.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Considering Kering's supply chain structure, upstream leased assets are not part of the Group activities therefore we do not consider this source of emissions to be relevant.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
73103

Emissions calculation methodology
Supplier-specific method
Fuel-based method
Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Downstream transportation and distribution emissions are calculated using 100% of data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners combining supplier specific, fuel based and distance based methods. For the first time in 2021, Kering worked specifically on collecting information about transportation flows relating to its e-commerce activities. These flows represented 73,073 tCO2 in 2021. E-commerce transportation flows taken into account in the carbon impact of transportation in 2021 cover 99% of the Group’s e-commerce activities. Furthermore, in 2021, a steering committee was set up under the aegis of the Group Managing Director to identify ways of improving the environmental impact of e-commerce transportation flows.

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Products sold by Kering Brands, due to their nature, do not involve significant CO2 emissions from processing of sold intermediate products by third parties (apparel, shoes, accessories). As such, we do not consider this source of Scope 3 CO2 emissions to be relevant.

Use of sold products

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
229711

Emissions calculation methodology
Hybrid method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Emissions related to the use of sold products are calculated using 0% of data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners. While the main scope of our EP&L focuses on the supply chain, Kering has been investigating impacts of product use and disposal at the end of its life. Kering started with a pilot project, with the purpose of generating data for the several maintenance processes and end of life routes that apply to Kering's garments and shoes in 6 countries (China, Italy, France, the UK, the USA and Japan). The pilot has been launched with one Brand of the Group that represents 50% of the total EP&L impact. The pilot showed that the use phase represents approximately 10% of the total EP&L impact in terms of carbon footprint. The LCAs were used to calculate the impact based on the habits captured in the consumer survey for the use phase (Dry cleaning VS hand wash etc.) The calculation of impacts for use phase are integrated in the EP&L since 2020 (all brands except watch/jewelry and eyewear) and are released in the 2021 EP&L report. It represents 7% of Kering's total carbon footprint.

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
8814

Emissions calculation methodology
Hybrid method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending Brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Emissions related to the end of life of products are calculated using 0% of data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners. While the main scope of our EP&L focuses on the supply chain, Kering has been investigating impacts of product use and disposal at the end of its life. Kering started with a pilot project, with the purpose of generating data for the several maintenance processes and end of life routes that apply to Kering's garments and shoes in 6 countries (China, Italy, France, the UK, the USA and Japan). The LCAs were used to calculate the impact based on the habits captured in the consumer survey for the end of life treatment (Second life VS recycling VS landfilled etc.) The calculation of impacts for end of life are integrated in the EP&L since 2020 (all brands except watch/jewelry and eyewear) and are released in the 2021 EP&L report. The impact of end of life is not material as it represents approximately 0.2% of the total impact in terms of carbon footprint. This is particularly relevant for the Luxury division as all product have a long lifetime compare to fast fashion which is due to long lasting and high-quality materials (top quality leather, precious metals for watches and jewellery...).

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Downstream leased assets are not part of the Group's activities, therefore we do not consider this source of emissions to be relevant.

Franchises

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering's business model distribution implies an increasing part of directly operated stores especially in the Luxury division, whereas the sport & lifestyle division in mainly driven by wholesale distribution. The franchises model is not material within Kering Group distribution channels, especially in the context of Kering's global strategy to grow direct retail activities vs wholesale. Therefore we do not consider this source of emissions to be relevant.

Investments

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Kering is measuring its carbon footprint through its EP&L account. GHG emissions are obtained using an hybrid approach which is blending brand primary data, suppliers primary data as well as extrapolated data. The approach is also combining LCA data and input output models. Investments are indirectly covered through input output models and represent less than 1% of the total Scope 3, therefore we do not consider this source of emissions to be relevant.

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
All the most relevant upstream emissions are already covered in the Purchased goods and services and upstream categories listed above.

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
All the most relevant downstream emissions are already covered in the downstream categories listed above.

C6.5a

(C6.5a) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

Start date
January 1 2020

End date
December 31 2020

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)
1577549

Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)
9676

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)
120151

Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)
6781

Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)
9

Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)
204646

Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)
8430

Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Past year 2

Start date
January 1 2019

End date
December 31 2019

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)
2116730

Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)
11149

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)
153388

Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)
32181

Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)
7

Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Comment
GHG emissions related to the use and end of life of product are calculated from 2020 onwards

Past year 3

Start date
January 1 2018

End date
December 31 2018

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)
2085865

Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)
12783

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)
149908

Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)
46209

Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)
9

Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)
100

Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)
100

Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Comment
GHG emissions related to the use and end of life of product are calculated from 2020 onwards

C6.7

(C6.7) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?
No

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
0.000001729

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)
30508

Metric denominator
unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total
17645200000

Scope 2 figure used
Market-based

% change from previous year
11

Direction of change
Decreased

Reason for change
In 2020, Kering's scope 1 and 2 totalled 25 527 tCO2e with revenue of 13 100 M€, resulting in a CO2 intensity per € revenue of 0.000001949 (=25 527/13 100 000 000), while in 2021, scope 1 and 2 equaled 30 508 tCO2e with revenue of 17 645 M€. The 2021 CO2 intensity per € revenue is therefore 0.000001729 (=30 508/17 645 200 000), corresponding to a 11% decrease versus previous year (=(0.000001729-0.000001949)/0.000001949). This good performance is attributable to: i) improvement in energy efficiency of stores and infrastructure: energy monitoring in stores, LEED certification for headquarters, LED lighting in stores, energy audits, etc.; ii) the gradual shifts towards renewable energy, reaching 92% of total Group consumption in 2021 thanks to numerous changes in the Houses' supply chains (commitment of reaching 100% by 2022)

Intensity figure
0.0164

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)
30508

Metric denominator
square meter

Metric denominator: Unit total
1856335

Scope 2 figure used
Market-based

% change from previous year
9

Direction of change
Increased

Reason for change
In 2020, Kering's scope 1 and 2 totalled 25 527 tCO2e with a total surface of sites of 1 700 275 sqm, resulting in a CO2 intensity per sqm of 0.0150 (=25 527/1 700 275), while in 2021, scope 1 and 2 equaled 30 508 tCO2e with occupied surface of 1 856 335 sqm. The 2021 CO2 intensity per sqm is therefore 0.0164 (=30 508/1 856 335), corresponding to a 9% increase versus previous year (=(0.0164-0.0150)/0.0150).

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

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

C7.1a

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
CO2	19281	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)
Australia	29.3
Austria	14.04
Bangladesh	31.59
Brazil	0.98
Canada	0.17
China	42.88
Croatia	39.3
Denmark	8.9
France	974.65
Germany	167.08
Guam	1.36
Hong Kong SAR, China	17.22
India	16.21
Italy	11944.75
Japan	221.67
Malaysia	4.71
Mexico	5.36
Netherlands	0.31
Romania	116.76
Russian Federation	6.66
Serbia	2910.83
Singapore	37.09
Republic of Korea	83.51
Spain	44.98
Switzerland	1954.44
Thailand	12.5
United Arab Emirates	27.61
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	74.26
United States of America	489.59
Viet Nam	2.05

C7.3

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

By business division

By activity

C7.3a

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

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Alexander Mc Queen	50.2
Balenciaga	249.37
Bottega Veneta	1116.99
Boucheron	35.99
Brioni	1102.71
Gucci	11143.9
Kering Corporate	3126.43
Pomellato	323.16
Kering Eyewear	1109.55
Qeelin	13.48
Sowind Group (Girard Perregaux)	147.36
Ulysse Nardin	141.82
Saint Laurent	719.84

C7.3c

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Industrial sites	10601.69
Offices	6103.26
Stores	561.6
Warehouses	2014.22

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)
Aruba	62.17	0
Australia	1590.49	1361.98
Austria	89.76	0
Bahrain	87.45	87.45
Bangladesh	0	0
Belgium	28.84	0
Brazil	187.1	0
Canada	297.4	0
Chile	66.64	0
China	16459.57	0
Croatia	1.22	0
Czechia	94.33	0
Denmark	57.36	0
France	1126.3	195.11
Germany	1010.07	0
Greece	69.93	0
Guam	244.35	0
Hong Kong SAR, China	4747.05	0
Hungary	42.19	0
India	348.88	0
Ireland	17.93	0
Italy	22615.35	0
Japan	8485.39	1630.93
Kuwait	651.57	652.37
Luxembourg	19.28	0
China, Macao Special Administrative Region	757.59	0
Malaysia	582.76	0
Mexico	784.88	0
Monaco	15.13	0
Netherlands	151.92	0
New Zealand	38.76	0
Pakistan	13.4	13.4
Panama	76.51	0
Philippines	394.44	0
Portugal	8.78	0
Puerto Rico	93.85	0
Qatar	118	118
Romania	423.19	0
Russian Federation	536.37	0.12
Serbia	3372.01	0
Singapore	875.54	4.12
South Africa	266.91	0
Republic of Korea	5484.99	5484.99
Spain	410.77	0
Switzerland	372.47	108.12
Taiwan, China	1556.78	1479.61
Thailand	677.41	0
Turkey	115.1	0
United Arab Emirates	1656.75	0.09
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1091.09	0.2
United States of America	10760.66	90.92
Viet Nam	205.65	0

C7.6

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

By business division

By activity

C7.6a

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

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Alexander Mc Queen	2119.33	128.18
Balenciaga	5814.63	1194.03
Bottega Veneta	10510.75	2421.9
Boucheron	597.53	114.56
Brioni	1665.02	0
Gucci	48302.48	5192.92
Kering Corporate	9521.14	1222.51
Pomellato	892.16	0
Kering Eyewear	1546.22	26.33
Qeelin	235.31	0
Sowind Group (Girard Perregaux)	26.02	0
Ulysse Nardin	186.26	46.2
Saint Laurent	7825.52	880.8

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)
Industrial sites	12255.86	46.08
Offices	12615.65	913.96
Stores	55935.42	9330.97
Warehouses	8435.43	936.42

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	305	Decreased	1	Between 2020 and 2021, Kering increased its use of renewable electricity by +28,392.95 MWh reaching 92% of total electricity use, +1pt compared to 2020. Scope 1&2 GHG emissions related to conventional electricity in 2021 amounted 30,508 tCO2. The 1% progress in green electricity has helped avoid the emission of (1 x 30,508) /100 = 305 tCO2 compared to 2020. Our total pro forma scopes 1 and 2 emissions in the previous year (2020) totalled 25,551 tCO2e. Therefore, the increased renewable energy consumption has helped reduce scope 1&2 GHG emissions by 1% (=305/25,551x100)
Other emissions reduction activities	3689	Decreased	14	In 2021, Kering avoided 3,689 tCO2e thanks to energy efficiency projects (Lighting, heating, AC). Our total 2020 scopes 1 and 2 emissions were equal to 25,551 tCO2e, which gives a reduction of (3,689/25,551)x100 = 14%.
Divestment		<Not Applicable>		
Acquisitions	8.9	Increased	0.03	In 2021, Kering acquired Lindberg, Danish luxury eyewear brand. The Scope 1 and 2 emissions of the new entity in Q4 are 8.9 tCO2e, resulting in a 0.03% increase (=8.9/25,551x100)
Mergers		<Not Applicable>		
Change in output	8942	Increased	35	Between 2020 and 2021, Kering's revenue increased by 35%, rebounding from the Covid-19 pandemic, overtaking 2019 level. As scope 1 and 2 in 2020 represented 25,551 tCO2e, the growth equals 25,551x35% = 8,942 tCO2
Change in methodology		<Not Applicable>		
Change in boundary		<Not Applicable>		
Change in physical operating conditions		<Not Applicable>		
Unidentified		<Not Applicable>		
Other		<Not Applicable>		

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 5% but less than or equal to 10%

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	No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Yes
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Yes

C8.2a

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

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	HHV (higher heating value)	860	66137	66997
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	229562	20062	249624
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	0	3568	3568
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	265	653	918
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	4700	<Not Applicable>	4700
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	235388	90420	325808

C8.2b

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

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

C8.2c

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

Sustainable biomass

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
860

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

Other biomass

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

Coal

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
606.67

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

Oil

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
2127.39

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

Gas

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
63403.03

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

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

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

Total fuel

Heating value
HHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
66997.08

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

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

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

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

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

Comment

C8.2d

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

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	4821.95	4699.76	4821.95	4699.76
Heat	0	0	0	0
Steam	0	0	0	0
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2g

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

Country/area
Aruba

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
99.68

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
99.68

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Australia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2312.44

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2312.44

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Austria

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
657.62

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
657.62

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Bahrain

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
126.96

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
126.96

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Bangladesh

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
0

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
0

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Belgium

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
173.61

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
173.61

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Brazil

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
1792.17

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1792.17

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Canada

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2291.2

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2291.2

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Chile

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
150.24

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
150.24

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
China

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
26305.84

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
26305.84

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Croatia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
6.85

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
6.85

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Czechia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
213.08

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
213.08

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Denmark

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
590.16

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
590.16

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
France

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
20935.03

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
2038.43

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
22973.46

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Germany

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2916.74

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2916.74

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Greece

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
140.65

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
140.65

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Guam

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
361.84

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
361.84

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Hong Kong SAR, China

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
5788.32

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
5788.32

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Hungary

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
184.25

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
184.25

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
India

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
480.49

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
480.49

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Ireland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
60.69

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
60.69

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Italy

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
80802.48

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
80802.48

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Japan

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
17359.63

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
17359.63

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Kuwait

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
1069.91

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
44.15

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1114.06

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Luxembourg

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
136.86

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
136.86

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
China, Macao Special Administrative Region

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2017.55

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2017.55

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Malaysia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
876.46

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
876.46

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Mexico

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
1970.08

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1970.08

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Monaco

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
281.22

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
281.22

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?

No

Country/area
Netherlands

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
411.27

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
411.27

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
New Zealand

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
316.17

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
316.17

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Pakistan

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
38.2

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
38.2

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Panama

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
184

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
184

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Philippines

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
584.1

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
584.1

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Portugal

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
36.98

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

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

36.98

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Puerto Rico

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
150.47

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
150.47

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Qatar

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
246.2

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
246.2

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Romania

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
1225.92

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1225.92

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Russian Federation

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
1430.33

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
6.01

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1436.34

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Serbia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
4524.97

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
4524.97

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Singapore

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2264.72

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

227.73

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2492.45

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
South Africa

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
284.98

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
284.98

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Republic of Korea

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
10603.12

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
10603.12

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Spain

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2062.1

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2062.1

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Switzerland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
15381.52

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
1007.57

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
16389.09

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Taiwan, China

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2799.97

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2799.97

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Thailand

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

1455.22

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1455.22

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Turkey

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
265.76

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
265.76

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
United Arab Emirates

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
3296.91

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
4.95

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
3301.86

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
5208.46

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
11.14

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
5219.6

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
United States of America

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
31135.82

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
1145.99

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
32281.81

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Viet Nam

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
315.31

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
315.31

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

C8.2h

(C8.2h) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity purchases in the reporting year by country

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Aruba

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
99.68

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
99.68

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Australia

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
332.24

Tracking instrument used
Australian LGC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
332.24

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Australia

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Austria

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
539.94

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
539.94

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

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

2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Austria

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
117.68

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
117.68

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Belgium

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
26.49

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
26.49

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Belgium

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
147.11

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)

147.11

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Brazil

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1792.17

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1792.17

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Brazil

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Canada

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
2291.2

Tracking instrument used
US-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
2291.2

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United States of America

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
Green-e

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Chile

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

150.24

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
150.24

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Chile

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
China

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
26305.84

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
26305.84

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
China

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Croatia

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
6.85

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
6.85

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Czechia

Sourcing method

Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
213.08

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
213.08

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Denmark

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
590.16

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
590.16

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
France

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
4187.91

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
4187.91

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
France

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
16747.12

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
16747.12

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Germany

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1544.33

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1544.33

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Germany

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1372.41

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1372.41

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Greece

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
140.65

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
140.65

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Guam

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
361.84

Tracking instrument used
US-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
361.84

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United States of America

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Hong Kong SAR, China

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
5788.32

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
5788.32

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
China

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Hungary

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
184.25

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
184.25

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
India

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
480.49

Tracking instrument used
Indian REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
480.49

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
India

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Ireland

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
60.69

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
60.69

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Italy

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
11023.79

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
11023.79

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Italy

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
68271.21

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
68271.21

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Japan

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, sustainable biomass)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
14023.03

Tracking instrument used
J-Credit

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
14023.03

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Japan

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Luxembourg

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
136.86

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
136.86

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
China, Macao Special Administrative Region

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
2017.55

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
2017.55

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
China

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Malaysia

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
876.46

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
876.46

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Malaysia

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Mexico

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1970.08

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1970.08

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Mexico

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Monaco

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
281.22

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
281.22

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Netherlands

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
316.15

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
316.15

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Netherlands

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
95.11

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
95.11

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
New Zealand

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
316.17

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
316.17

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
New Zealand

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Panama

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
184

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
184

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Panama

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Philippines

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
584.1

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
584.1

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Philippines

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Portugal

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
36.98

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
36.98

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Puerto Rico

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
150.47

Tracking instrument used
US-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
150.47

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United States of America

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Romania

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1225.92

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1225.92

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Russian Federation

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1430.33

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1430.33

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Russian Federation

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Serbia

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
4524.97

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
4524.97

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Singapore

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
2264.72

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
2264.72

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Singapore

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
South Africa

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
284.98

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
284.98

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
South Africa

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Spain

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
794.81

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
794.81

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Spain

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1267.29

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1267.29

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Please select

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Switzerland

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
9282.18

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
9282.18

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Switzerland

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
6045.61

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
6045.61

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Italy

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Taiwan, China

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
138.79

Tracking instrument used
T-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
138.79

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Taiwan, China

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Thailand

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1455.22

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1455.22

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Thailand

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Turkey

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
265.76

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
265.76

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Turkey

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
United Arab Emirates

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
3280.05

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
3280.05

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United Arab Emirates

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
2493.62

Tracking instrument used
REGO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
2493.62

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Sourcing method
Green electricity products from an energy supplier (e.g. Green Tariffs)

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind, hydro, marine, geothermal)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
2692.17

Tracking instrument used
REGO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
2692.17

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
United States of America

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
28036.8

Tracking instrument used
US-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
28036.8

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United States of America

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
Green-e

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Viet Nam

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Solar, wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
315.31

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
315.31

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Viet Nam

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2012

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
EKOenergy label

Comment

C8.2i

(C8.2i) Provide details of your organization's low-carbon heat, steam, and cooling purchases in the reporting year by country.

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

Sourcing method
Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

Energy carrier
Cooling

Low-carbon technology type
Renewable energy mix

Low-carbon heat, steam, or cooling consumed (MWh)
264.92

Comment
French utility Climespace provides Kering's sites in Paris with district cooling that gets hydrotermal chill from Seine river water and declares to use green electricity to feed chillers.

C8.2j

(C8.2j) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity generation by country in the reporting year.

Country/area of generation
Italy

Renewable electricity technology type
Solar

Facility capacity (MW)
1379

Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)
1516.91

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were not issued (MWh)
1507.48

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were issued and retired (MWh)

Renewable electricity sold to the grid in the reporting year (MWh)
9.43

Certificates issued for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)
0

Certificates issued and retired for self-consumption for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)
0

Type of energy attribute certificate
<Not Applicable>

Total self-generation counted towards RE100 target (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
<Calculated field>

Comment
In Italy the Kering Group has photovoltaic plants at 9 sites. In Italy the electricity self-generated so far by solar system is under net-metering agreements (with the exception of one site), so that energy produced in excess at some moment is fed to the grid, metered and detracted from energy absorbed from the grid in other moments. Due to the small quantities of energy and to the strict fiscal control over solar energy, Kering did not yet consider the need of issuing certificates and cancelling them within the same site. Energy produced and sold to the grid is not considered as part as the fraction of renewable energy used by the Group.

Country/area of generation
Singapore

Renewable electricity technology type
Solar

Facility capacity (MW)
0.08

Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)
112.76

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were not issued (MWh)

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were issued and retired (MWh)

Renewable electricity sold to the grid in the reporting year (MWh)
112.76

Certificates issued for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Certificates issued and retired for self-consumption for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Type of energy attribute certificate
<Not Applicable>

Total self-generation counted towards RE100 target (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
<Calculated field>

Comment
Due to the small quantities of energy and to the strict fiscal control over solar energy, Kering did not yet consider the need of issuing certificates and cancelling them within the same site. Energy produced and sold to the grid is not considered as part as the fraction of renewable energy used by the Group.

Country/area of generation
Switzerland

Renewable electricity technology type
Solar

Facility capacity (MW)
0.05

Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)
53.73

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were not issued (MWh)
53.73

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were issued and retired (MWh)

Renewable electricity sold to the grid in the reporting year (MWh)

Certificates issued for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Certificates issued and retired for self-consumption for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Type of energy attribute certificate
<Not Applicable>

Total self-generation counted towards RE100 target (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
<Calculated field>

Comment
In Switzerland Kering has only one small PV system installed on a very large site (the rest of the roof is rented for a 1 MW PV facility owned and operated by the local utility) All the production is self-consumed. Due to the small quantities of energy and to the strict fiscal control over solar energy, Kering did not yet consider the need of issuing certificates and cancelling them within the same site.

Country/area of generation
United Arab Emirates

Renewable electricity technology type
Solar

Facility capacity (MW)
0

Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)
16.86

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were not issued (MWh)
16.86

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were issued and retired (MWh)

Renewable electricity sold to the grid in the reporting year (MWh)

Certificates issued for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Certificates issued and retired for self-consumption for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Type of energy attribute certificate
<Not Applicable>

Total self-generation counted towards RE100 target (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
<Calculated field>

Comment
In the United Arab Emirates Kering has only one very small PV system installed. All the production is self-consumed. Due to the small quantities of energy and to the strict fiscal control over solar energy, Kering did not yet consider the need of issuing certificates and cancelling them within the same site

---

Country/area of generation
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Renewable electricity technology type
Solar

Facility capacity (MW)
0.02

Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)
22.67

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were not issued (MWh)
22.67

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were issued and retired (MWh)

Renewable electricity sold to the grid in the reporting year (MWh)

Certificates issued for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Certificates issued and retired for self-consumption for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Type of energy attribute certificate
<Not Applicable>

Total self-generation counted towards RE100 target (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
<Calculated field>

Comment
In the United Kingdom Kering has only one small PV system installed. All the production is self-consumed. Due to the small quantities of energy and to the strict fiscal control over solar energy, Kering did not yet consider the need of issuing certificates and cancelling them within the same site.

Country/area of generation
United States of America

Renewable electricity technology type
Solar

Facility capacity (MW)
2.8

Total renewable electricity generated by this facility in the reporting year (MWh)
3099.02

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were not issued (MWh)
3099.02

Renewable electricity directly consumed by your organization from this facility in the reporting year for which certificates were issued and retired (MWh)

Renewable electricity sold to the grid in the reporting year (MWh)

Certificates issued for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Certificates issued and retired for self-consumption for the renewable electricity that was sold to the grid (MWh)

Type of energy attribute certificate
<Not Applicable>

Total self-generation counted towards RE100 target (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
<Calculated field>

Comment
In the USA Kering has one large PV system installed on the main logistic site in the country, In new Jersey, working under the New Jersey net metering scheme. Kering did not yet consider the need of issuing certificates and cancelling them within the same site.

C8.2k

(C8.2k) Describe how your organization's renewable electricity sourcing strategy directly or indirectly contributes to bringing new capacity into the grid in the countries/areas in which you operate.

Kering's energy strategy is part of the publicly available Kering Climate Strategy, issued in 2021. This contributes to bring new capacity into the grid in the following ways:

1. By increasing energy efficiency and electrifying all energy uses, using renewable electricity. Efficiency itself does not bring new renewable capacity to the grid, but improves the ratio renewable/brown energy. Moving away from fossil fuels for thermal and mobility needs electrifying them increases the need of electricity, which we mandate to be from renewable source, thus increasing demand for it.

2. By increasing self-production of renewable energy. Out of the 4 MWp installed at the end of 2021, 3 went online between late 2020 and early 2021. In July 2022, another 13 MWp went online. The maximum potential for self-production is estimated at around 30-40 MW at Group level depending on the technology.

3. By entering into PPAs. In April 2022 Kering signed a MOU to enter a CVPPA in Europe. The CVPPA is expected to be signed by the end of 2022. The following step will be another CVPPA in the US.

4. By using EACs in all countries where this is doable for 100% of the used electricity, through green electricity contracts or through unbundled purchase of EACs. As regards Kering EACs purchase, we request our suppliers to provide us EACs only from solar and wind source, from power plants that are less than 10 years old. These two conditions on EACs, which in 2022 could not be met in all countries, are meant to boost additionality and push for the increase of renewable capacity in the countries where we operate.

5. By asking our suppliers to do the same: increase efficiency, electrify their energy uses, source renewable energy via self-production, PPAs or bundled or unbundled EACs.

C8.2l

(C8.2l) In the reporting year, has your organization faced any challenges to sourcing renewable electricity?

	Challenges to sourcing renewable electricity	Challenges faced by your organization which were not country-specific
Row 1	No	<Not Applicable>

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

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

Description
Please select

Metric value

Metric numerator

Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

% change from previous year

Direction of change
<Not Applicable>

Please explain

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
Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf
CDP_verification_template_DTT2021-signed.pdf

Page/ section reference
Scope 1 CO2 emissions are published at page 219 of the Sustainability Chapter of Kering's 2021 Universal Registration Document. The Statutory auditor's assurance statement (English version) is found at p.275-277. The CDP template was also completed by our Statutory Auditors with details of GHGs emissions by scope verified, see enclosed "CDP_verification_template_DTT2021_signed.pdf"

Relevant standard
ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

C10.1b

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

Scope 2 approach
Scope 2 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
Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf
CDP_verification_template_DTT2021-signed.pdf

Page/ section reference
Scope 2 CO2 emissions are published at page 219 of the Sustainability Chapter of Kering's 2021 Universal Registration Document. The Statutory auditor's assurance statement (English version) is found at p.275-277. The CDP template was also completed by our Statutory Auditors with details of GHGs emissions by scope verified, see enclosed "CDP_verification_template_DTT2021_signed.pdf"

Relevant standard
ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

C10.1c

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

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
Scope 3: Business travel
Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

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
Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf
CDP_verification_template_DTT2021-signed.pdf

Page/section reference
Scope 3 CO2 emissions are published at page 219 of the Sustainability Chapter of Kering's 2021 Universal Registration Document. The Statutory auditor's assurance statement (English version) is found at p.275-277. The CDP template was also completed by our Statutory Auditors with details of GHGs emissions by scope verified, see enclosed "CDP_verification_template_DTT2021_signed.pdf"

Relevant standard
ISAE3000

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?
Yes

C10.2a

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

Disclosure module verification relates to	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
C4. Targets and performance	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1 and 2)	ISAE 3000	Scope 1&2 CO2 emissions are published at page 219 of the Sustainability Chapter of Kering's 2021 Universal Registration Document. The Statutory auditor's assurance statement (English version) is found at p.275-277 and is covering both CO2 emissions and year on year change."Pursuant to the request of the Company, we performed additional work with the aim of providing a reasonable assurance conclusion on the following Information: energy consumption and associated CO2 emissions, Renewable electricity proportion at Group level, Emissions associated with “B to B” transport, tons of CO2 offset."
C4. Targets and performance	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 3)	ISAE 3000	Scope 3 CO2 emissions are published at page 219 of the Sustainability Chapter of Kering's 2021 Universal Registration Document. The Statutory auditor's assurance statement (English version) is found at p.275-277 and is covering both CO2 emissions and year on year change."Pursuant to the request of the Company, we performed additional work with the aim of providing a reasonable assurance conclusion on the following Information: energy consumption and associated CO2 emissions, Renewable electricity proportion at Group level, Emissions associated with “B to B” transport, tons of CO2 offset."

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

C11.2

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

C11.2a

(C11.2a) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits originated or purchased by your organization in the reporting period.

Credit origination or credit purchase
Credit purchase

Project type
Forests

Project identification
As part of its Net Zero commitment, Kering has been supporting offsetting programs since 2012 via REDD+ projects. The carbon offsetting (in 2021 in respect of 2020 CO2 emissions) of all of the Group's activities (Scopes 1 and 2 and part of Scope 3) and its supply chain (Scope 3), representing a total of 1,779,888 TCO2 via REDD+ certified projects, protects and restores sensitive ecosystems (forests, wetlands, coastal areas) as well as supporting green energy generation projects. In addition, Kering is continuing to diversity its carbon offsetting approach to include other natural climate solutions, such as regenerative farming practices that enhance carbon sequestration and mangrove restoration. Since 2020, Kering has also invested in Low Carbon Label projects, in partnership with IDELE (Institut de l'Élevage), which support French cattle breeders in developing more carbon efficient practices. In 2021, Gucci continued with its efforts to achieve its carbon neutrality commitment within its operations and its supply chain, primarily through its Natural Climate Solutions Portfolio. The House maintained its support programs to protect and restore nature through REDD+ offsetting projects. These projects help to combat climate change while also having a positive economic and social impact on local communities, as well as protecting flora and fauna. This includes protecting undisturbed land by means of "green carbon" offsetting projects and restoring forests and wetlands (mainly mangroves) through "blue carbon" REDD+ projects, which are particularly effective for carbon sequestration and storage. Gucci has also continued to roll out the regenerative agriculture project for managing agricultural land in its own supply chains and beyond.

Verified to which standard
VCS (Verified Carbon Standard)

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)
1779888

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume
1779888

Credits cancelled
Yes

Purpose, e.g. compliance
Voluntary Offsetting

C11.3

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

C11.3a

(C11.3a) Provide details of how your organization uses an internal price on carbon.

Objective for implementing an internal carbon price
Stakeholder expectations
Change internal behavior
Drive energy efficiency
Drive low-carbon investment
Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
Supplier engagement

GHG Scope
Scope 1
Scope 2
Scope 3

Application
Since 2012, Kering has been working on the creation and deployment of its Environmental Profit and Loss account (EP&L), and successfully covering all its activities since 2014. The EP&L is an innovative tool designed to assess impacts and reliance on natural resources. Kering uses an internal carbon price mainly to support procurement towards sustainable sourcing decisions, through its EP&L methodology. The EP&L methodology integrates a carbon price as part of the global monetization of the environmental impacts. Quantifying and valuing all impacts in monetary terms enables trade-offs to be considered across types of impact, locations, materials, processes, products and technologies. This ultimately helps us prioritize our actions and drive investments towards environmental impact reduction activities including carbon footprint reduction projects.

Actual price(s) used (Currency /metric ton)
86.4

Variance of price(s) used
Kering uses a global uniform pricing that is applicable to Kering business at a global scale. This price may be revised every 3 years following the EP&L methodology. For instance, until 2017 the price was set to 62 € per tons of CO2 equivalent, and was upgraded in 2018 to 73.5 € per tons of CO2 equivalent. In 2020, valuation coefficients were updated and are still valid for 2021. This resulted in an average increase of 15% across the different impact indicators. The ton of CO2e has risen to €86.4 per ton of CO2e.

Type of internal carbon price
Other, please specify (EP&L input)

Impact & implication
Since 2012, Kering has been working on the creation and deployment of its Environmental Profit and Loss account (EP&L), and successfully covering all its activities since 2014. The EP&L is an innovative tool designed to assess impacts and reliance on natural resources. Kering uses an internal carbon price mainly to support procurement towards sustainable sourcing decisions, through its EP&L methodology. The EP&L methodology integrates a carbon price as part of the global monetization of the environmental impacts. The EP&L is used to evaluate sourcing scenarii depending on various factors such as the type of raw material, its production geographical location and the type of manufacturing process. More in detail: (i) The EP&L covers all scope 1/2/3 emissions up to the Group's Tier 4 suppliers (raw material extraction). (ii) It makes it possible to attribute a monetary value to the Company's environmental impacts throughout its supply chain. The EP&L is covering 6 indicators among which the GHG emissions which impact is monetized, as publicly described in the methodology part of Kering EP&L detailed on the Kering Website: https://www.kering.com/en/sustainability/environmental-profit-loss/methodology/ and here https://kering-group.opendatasoft.com/pages/methodology/ (iii) In this context the price of carbon that Kering uses is 86.4€ per tonnes of CO2 equivalent (iv) This price is applicable globally, and may be revised every 3 year following the EP&L methodology (v) Initial price evaluation is performed by Kering sustainability team which is peer reviewed by expert. The EP&L methodology (including carbon pricing) is ultimately reviewed and approved by the Sustainability Committee at Board level (vi) Carbon pricing and monetization of other key environmental indicators led the Group to explore new sourcing strategies for key raw materials (cotton, leather, wool, cashmere...). This new sourcing decision has already been taken based on EP&L figures. See the latest interactive 2021 Group EP&L report , the overview of the strategic decisions, and results of use of the EP&L here: https://kering-group.opendatasoft.com/pages/home/

C12. Engagement

C12.1

(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?
Yes, our suppliers
Yes, other partners in the value chain

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
1

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)
45

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
25

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
The flagship initiative is the Clean By Design (CBD) program aiming at reducing textile manufacturers' environmental footprint, which Kering started to take part in 2014 with 24 of its key brands' suppliers (in terms of criticality and volumes produced), mainly weaving, printing and dyeing plants in Italy. Since 2015, Clean by Design has been implemented on the premises of Tier 1 and Tier 2 suppliers located in Italy (dyeing, printing and finishing factories, spinning and weaving mills, denim laundries) and has also been extended to other activities further up supply chains through wool cleaning factories and silk mills, totaling to date 37 suppliers, 3 factories and 3 mills representing 45% of total spend in 2021. % of suppliers by number: In 2021, Kering had 4,107 direct suppliers, contractors and subcontractors. This makes 43/4,107 = 1% Rationale for the coverage of engagement: The program focuses on the textile supply chain, excluding to date leather goods, shoes and hard luxury. All of Kering's ready to wear brands are participating to this group-led initiative since its launch and have included its scope to new suppliers. Direct suppliers were selected mostly among the more energy and water intensive ones according to their importance in terms of criticality and volumes produced for the Kering Brands. The main criterion was the importance in terms of value of direct purchases. In addition, other suppliers/subcontractors were selected considering their importance in the production chain & the related environmental footprint (such as wet processing). Suppliers have been selected for CBD to cover all key processes/steps of clothing production. Volumes produced by suppliers for Kering is around 20-30% of their total production for spinning, weaving, dyeing and printing. As the efficiency gain benefits from Clean by Design affect the whole production process of participating suppliers, efficiency gain benefits impact volume beyond volumes sourced by Kering. We estimate them to represent around 20-30% of total emissions throughout tier 1 and tier 2 suppliers. These suppliers are representing about 45% of our direct purchases in 2021.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
(i) Impact of engagement and measures of success including threshold All Kering's ready to wear brands (Gucci, Alexander McQueen, Saint Laurent, Balenciaga, Bottega Veneta and Brioni) are participating to this group-led initiative since its launch and have included its scope to new suppliers, reflecting the success of the program. The factories involved in the program received an assessment of their energy efficiency, and water and chemicals use from Kering, and subsequently agreed to take certain initiatives to improve their performance, reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions (for example, complete elimination of the direct use of liquid fossil fuels, replaced by electricity, biomass, natural gas and LPG). The cornerstone of Clean by Design (CbD) is a set of 10 Best Practices that when implemented in any production facility can deliver almost immediate return on investment – most projects pay for themselves in less than one year. Measures of success includes the monitoring of suppliers' climate performance, and the consequent monitoring of Kering's Scope 3 emissions. For Kering, supplier GHG emissions reductions contribute to the achievement of Kering's scope 3 emissions 'reduction target and participate to reinforce the resilience of our supply chain to climate-related risks. Kering 1.5°C SBT target includes a reduction of 70% scope 3 intensity (CO_2 emissions per unit value added) between 2015 and 2030. Between 2015 and 2021 Kering has already reduced its scope 3 intensity by 47% which puts the Group on track to reach its scope 3 target. (ii) Impact of climate-related supplier engagement strategy: The program has compelling economic appeal, since the return on investment of efficiency initiatives for the 43 suppliers participating in the programme is less than 2.5 years in Italy and less than one year in China. The average energy savings obtained are 19% per site following participation in the programme – mainly in the range of 10% to 20%, with highs of 40%. It is estimated that the programme contributed to 13.600 TCO_2/year reduction in annual CO_2 emissions supporting progress toward Kering Scope 3 targets. In 2021, Kering announced the extension of Clean by Design in Italy with the Apparel Impact Institute (Aii), in partnership with Stella McCartney and Burberry.

Comment

C12.1d

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

(i) A clear explanation of who other partners in the value chain are involved:

Kering strongly believes that committing collectively to a common core of quantified environmental objectives focusing on a few themes is the best way to really have an impact, especially in the couture and leather goods industry and watch and jewellery industry. Therefore the Group developed a strong climate-related engagement strategy with its peers, i.e., other brands in the same industries, through its participation to the launch of the Fashion Pact and the Watch and Jewellery Initiative 2030 for example. Thus, the other partners in the value chain with whom Kering have a climate-related engagement strategy is the other brands in the same industries.

(ii) A case study of your climate-related engagement strategy with other partners in the value chain

Situation: Kering's GHG emissions from Watch and jewellery are significant in its GHG balance, and this is the case for all brands that are in the same industry.

Task: Driven by a common conviction that the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and aspirations for a sustainable industry can only be achieved through collaborative initiatives, Cartier, delegated by Richemont, and Kering, in partnership with the Responsible Jewellery Council (RJC), have come together to broaden and strengthen their action, by launching the Watch and Jewellery Initiative 2030 in October 2021. The aim of this initiative is to unite Watch & Jewellery brands committing to ambitious goals while collaborating on projects that deliver impact all along the value chain.

Action: Building on strong, existing initiatives such as the Science Based Targets (SBT), the Watch and Jewellery Initiative 2030 includes new areas of focus such as science-based targets, biodiversity protection and materials and business model innovation, with the intent of encouraging and enabling industry transformation and innovation. The Initiative encourages watch and jewellery brands to commit to a set of ambitious and common key sustainability objectives in three areas: building climate resilience, preserving resources, and fostering inclusiveness. The members are asked to set tangible targets for climate, biodiversity, and inclusiveness, and the Initiative strongly commits to transparency with the requirement to report on progress on a regular basis. Indeed, as a minimum commitment, brands joining the initiative should engage in signing and submitting the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) within one year, thus setting science-based emission reduction targets for Scope 1, 2 and 3. The Initiative also supports members in meeting growing expectations of stakeholders, including consumers, civil society, and regulators, of exemplary environmental, social and ethical practices.

Result: At the end of 2021, the Watch and Jewellery Initiative 2030 counted 7 signatory members (Cartier, Chanel Horlogerie Joaillerie, Chow Tai Fook, Kering, Montblanc, RJC, and Swarovski). The objective is to unite Watch and jewellery brands committing to ambitious goals while collaborating on projects that deliver impact all along the value chain, including decarbonization.

Kering's climate strategy is strongly relying on partnerships with the other organizations and brands, including NGOs and research institutes, such as the project with the Apparel Impact Institute, Burberry, and Stella McCartney to improve the environmental footprint of Italy's luxury fashion supply chain, as well as its partnership with IDELE (Institut de l'Elevage) which support French cattle breeders in developing more carbon-efficient practices.

C12.2

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

Yes, climate-related requirements are included in our supplier contracts

C12.2a

(C12.2a) Provide details of the climate-related requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process and the compliance mechanisms in place.

Climate-related requirement

Climate-related disclosure through a non-public platform

Description of this climate related requirement

The 'Kering Standards' are a guide for the Group's suppliers to ensure that their practices comply with the social and environmental criteria, including climate-related criteria, by Kering and its Brands. They are aligned with Kering's ambitious 2025 sustainability strategy, and they support the Group in achieving its objectives in terms of raw materials traceability, social compliance, environmental protection, animal welfare and the use of chemicals. These Standards aim to take a holistic and responsible approach to the manufacture of products offered by Kering Brands, to take responsibility for every step of the supply chain, from the field / livestock to the finished product. The market as a whole is moving towards more sustainable practices, especially on climate change. Adhering to Kering Standards allow suppliers to anticipate and position themselves at the forefront of these developments. All suppliers are evaluated to determine their compliance with the Kering Standards in the 'Sustainability' section of the Kering Vendor Rating System, including emissions reduction initiative and/or commitment. This rating system is available to all Kering Brands: this aims to further encourage suppliers to comply with Kering Standards if they wish to increase their commercial opportunities with the Group's brands. The objective is to have 100% of suppliers compliant with the Kering Standards by 2025.

% suppliers by procurement spend that have to comply with this climate-related requirement

100

% suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this climate-related requirement

95

Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this climate-related requirement

Supplier self-assessment
Supplier scorecard or rating

Response to supplier non-compliance with this climate-related requirement

Retain and engage
Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf

C12.3

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

Row 1

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

Yes, we engage directly with policy makers

Yes, we engage indirectly through trade associations

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

Yes

Attach commitment or position statement(s)

KERING_ClimateStrategy2021 def3.pdf

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

One of the missions of the Sustainability Committee at Board level is to ensure that all direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with Kering's overall climate change strategy. The Committee comprises six Directors, with a balance between independent directors and executive directors. The Committee has been particularly active in the definition of the Group 2025 sustainability strategy and the implementation of its science-based target for GHG emissions. Moreover, Kering's Chief Sustainability Officer, member of the Executive Committee, who directly reports to Kering's chairman and CEO, is also Head of international institutional affairs. She is responsible for both the development of Kering's sustainability strategy and the direction of the Group's institutional affairs, therefore keeping direct and indirect policy influence activities in line with Group's sustainability strategy, including climate strategy. In addition, since 2019, there is a lead independent Director at Board level. Alongside the typical duties associated with this position, acting as the Board's spokesperson vis- à- vis investors on environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues, in liaison with the Chairman. Lastly, coordination towards Kering's sustainability strategy, especially regarding climate change, is ensured through a network of managers dedicated to sustainability issues in each Brands. The Sustainability Leads meet regularly to coordinate and determine the pace of implementation of the sustainability strategy, including climate change mitigation, and to draw up action plans to deal with cross-company issues within the Group, as well as more specific issues affecting individual brands.

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

C12.3a

(C12.3a) On what policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Focus of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Climate-related targets

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

The Fashion Pact is a global coalition of companies in the fashion and textile industry (ready-to-wear, sport, lifestyle and luxury) along with suppliers and distributors, all committed to a common core of key environmental goals in three areas: stopping global warming, restoring biodiversity and protecting the oceans.

Policy, law, or regulation geographic coverage

Global

Country/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

<Not Applicable>

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

Support with no exceptions

Description of engagement with policy makers

In preparation for the G7 meeting held in Biarritz, France in August 2019, French president Emmanuel Macron tasked François-Henri Pinault, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Kering, with bringing together fashion and textile companies to set practical objectives for reducing their industry's environmental impact. Kering was a founding member leading to the creation of the Fashion Pact. Kering is leading the Fashion Pact, that resulted in an historic move, given the scale and importance of the coalition: 63 companies representing more than 250 brands have now signed the Fashion Pact. The participating companies have notably pledged to take action to achieve the objective of zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, in order to keep global warming below 1.5°C between now and 2100. In 2020, the Fashion Pact published its first progress report.

Details of exceptions (if applicable) and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law or regulation

<Not Applicable>

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

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.3b

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

Trade association
Federation of French Industry (MEDEF)

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

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?
We are not attempting to influence their position

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

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)
0

Describe the aim of your organization's funding
<Not Applicable>

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?
Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.4

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

Publication
In mainstream reports, in line with the CDSB framework (as amended to incorporate the TCFD recommendations)

Status
Complete

Attach the document
Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf

Page/Section reference
- Chap 3.2.4 Adapting our business model to climate issues: Kering's alignment with TCFD principles / p210-212 - Chap 3.2.5 Environmental impact of our operations (Tier 0) / p213-224 - Chap 4 - BUILDING TOGETHER ENVIRONMENTALLY AND SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE SUPPLY CHAINS / p234-249

Content elements
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

C15. Biodiversity

C15.1

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

	Board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues	Description of oversight and objectives relating to biodiversity	Scope of board-level oversight
Row 1	Yes, both board-level oversight and executive management-level responsibility	- The Chairman of the Board and CEO of Kering is responsible for aligning the global Group's strategy with its sustainability strategy – which includes biodiversity-related targets and goals in connection with SDG15 – by keeping economic, social, and environmental ambitions high and promoting the Group's ethics and the corporate citizenship commitments, reflected through clear policies and tangible initiatives. The Chairman of the Board and CEO is a member of the Sustainability Committee at board level to oversee the Group's sustainability strategy, including its biodiversity-related strategy and issues. 30% of Kering's Chairman of the Board and CEO's variable remuneration is incentivized over non-financial criteria, with a 10% dedicated to Sustainability, including biodiversity-related targets and goals. in addition Kering's Chairman of the Board and CEO initiated the Fashion Pact in 2019, as a mission given to him by the French President, to bring together over 250 fashion and textile players representing more than one-third of production volumes in the fashion and textile industry and committing them to take action to halt climate change, restore biodiversity and protect the oceans. Following publication of its first progress report in October 2020, the Fashion Pact continued to structure its orgainzation in 2021 and by the end of the year was supervising a total of 14 projects (already launched or in the launch process). The coalition implemented an operations structure, with a Steering Committee bringing together the CEOs of the member brands and an Operations Committee of Chief Sustainability Officers. Kering's CEO served in 2021 as co-chair of the Steering Committee, participating to its 3 meetings. The Fashion Pact's signatories, including Kering, have committed to the implementation of Science Based Targets (SBTs) for Climate to achieve net-zero carbon impact by 2050 . Following this commitment, the Chairman of the Board and CEO made the decision in 2020 to update Kering's Science-based target to be fully aligned with a 1.5°C trajectory. This updated SBT has been approved by the SBTi in April 2021.	<Not Applicable>

C15.2

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

	Indicate whether your organization made a public commitment or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity	Biodiversity-related public commitments	Initiatives endorsed
Row 1	Yes, we have made public commitments and publicly endorsed initiatives related to biodiversity	Commitment to Net Positive Gain Commitment to No Net Loss Adoption of the mitigation hierarchy approach Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species Commitment to no conversion of High Conservation Value areas Commitment to no trade of CITES listed species Other, please specify (By 2025, Kering will regenerate one million hectares of farms and rangelands in our supply chain landscapes + Kering will protect one million hectares of critical, 'irreplaceable' habitat outside of our supply chain)	CBD – Global Biodiversity Framework SDG CITES Other, please specify (Fashion Pact: Kering is a member of the Fashion Pact, a coalition bringing together 250 fashion and textile players, committed to take action to halt climate change, restore biodiversity and protect the oceans.)

C15.3

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

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

C15.4

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

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

C15.5

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

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
Row 1	Yes, we use indicators	Other, please specify (Environmental Profit & Loss Account, to assess biodiversity impact through the landuse conversion impact group and monetisation of ecosystems services loss.)

C15.6

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

Report type	Content elements	Attach the document and indicate where in the document the relevant biodiversity information is located
In voluntary sustainability report or other voluntary communications	Content of biodiversity-related policies or commitments Governance Impacts on biodiversity Details on biodiversity indicators Biodiversity strategy	Kering's Biodiversity Strategy presents the Group's approach on preserving natural resources, structured around four phases (avoidance, reduction, restoration/regeneration, and transformation) aligned with the SBT framework Kering Biodiversity Strategy.pdf
In voluntary sustainability report or other voluntary communications	Content of biodiversity-related policies or commitments Governance Impacts on biodiversity Influence on public policy and lobbying Other, please specify (colloboration and coalition's progress)	This report is a summary of The Fashion Pact's progress and accomplishments, as well as plans within the three primary pillars of Climate, Biodiversity, and Oceans. Fashion Pact progress report.pdf
In mainstream financial reports	Content of biodiversity-related policies or commitments Governance Impacts on biodiversity Details on biodiversity indicators Risks and opportunities Biodiversity strategy	Universal registration document with annual progress, commitment and actions - page 237 onwards section 4.2.1 Responsible land use and protection of biodiversity - pages 201-202 Biodiversity strategy - pages 304, 316 risks Kering_2021_Universal_Registration_Document.pdf

C16. Signoff

C-FI

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

C16.1

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

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Chief Sustainability Officer, member of the executive committee appointed by Kering's Chairman of the Board & CEO, has direct responsibility for climate change strategy.	Board/Executive board

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	

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.

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
Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level	The below could help overcome these allocation challenges: - Identify customer categories (countries, age categories etc.) and their purchasing practices through an in-depth study, specifically the end of life and use phase practices per category of client; - Build product level data for our goods with the CO2 impact of each product.

SC1.4

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

SC1.4a

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

In 2020, Kering added the impact of product use and end of life to the analysis starting from the 2020 Group EP&L. Further work and studies are planned to pursue capturing consumer care and disposal behaviours towards luxury products and enabling to understand and quantify the full lifecycle of a product from cradle to grave.

Now that these downstream impacts are integrated into the EP&L, Kering intends to explore this further to identify areas of material impact, where targeted interventions would help to reduce the EP&L value. For example, for the ready-to-wear product category the consumer use phase and end of life impacts make up 29% of the total lifecycle impact (compared to 12% as the average across all product categories). Possible interventions could include a customer outreach programme or product care labels to build consumers awareness around how the consumer use phase choices influence the environmental impact of a product.

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?

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?
English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

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

The European Climate Pact Submission

Please indicate your consent for CDP to showcase your disclosed environmental actions on the European Climate Pact website as pledges to the Pact.
Yes, we wish to pledge to the European Climate Pact through our CDP disclosure

Please confirm below
I have read and accept the applicable Terms