Levi Strauss & Co.

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

09/26/2024, 07:04 pm

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

From our California Gold Rush beginnings, we have grown into one of the world's largest brand-name apparel companies. A history of responsible business practices, rooted in our core values, has helped us build our brands and engender consumer trust around the world. Under our Levi's, Dockers, Signature by Levi Strauss & Co. and Denizen brands, we design, market and sell – directly or through third parties and licensees – products that include jeans, casual and dress pants, tops, shorts, skirts, dresses, jackets, footwear, and related accessories for men, women and children around the world. Our newest brand, Beyond Yoga, acquired in 2021, is a body positive, premium athleisure apparel brand focused on quality, fit and comfort for all shapes and sizes. Our products are sold in over 45,000 retail locations worldwide, including approximately 3,200 brand-dedicated stores and shop-in-shops.
[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	11/26/2023	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

6179000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?	How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?
	Select from: ☑ No	*Our financial statements are limited to our owned and operated activity, whereas our CDP disclosure includes suppliers’ emissions.*

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US52736R1023

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

52736R102

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

LEVI

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Kenya

- ☑ Egypt
- ☑ India
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ France
- ☑ Greece
- ☑ Mexico
- ☑ Norway
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Czechia
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Cambodia
- ☑ Colombia
- ☑ Malaysia
- ☑ Pakistan
- ☑ Portugal
- ☑ Indonesia
- ☑ Mauritius
- ☑ Singapore
- ☑ Sri Lanka
- ☑ Bangladesh
- ☑ Switzerland
- ☑ South Africa
- ☑ Taiwan, China
- ☑ Republic of Korea
- ☑ Dominican Republic
- ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Turkey
- ☑ Algeria
- ☑ Austria
- ☑ Hungary
- ☑ Ireland
- ☑ Lesotho
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Bulgaria
- ☑ Thailand
- ☑ Viet Nam
- ☑ Argentina
- ☑ Australia
- ☑ Guatemala
- ☑ Madagascar
- ☑ El Salvador
- ☑ Netherlands
- ☑ New Zealand
- ☑ Philippines
- ☑ United Arab Emirates
- ☑ United States of America
- ☑ United Republic of Tanzania
- ☑ Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
- ☑ China, Macao Special Administrative Region

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No, this is confidential data	*Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information*

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

We leverage several IT solutions that allows us to see our full global supply chain network down to Tier 3, allowing us to have more supply chain visibility for traceability, risk management and supplier due diligence purposes.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Climate and water-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

7

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

Climate and water-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

7

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

12

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

Climate and water-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term.
[Fixed row]

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

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from:	*Select from:*

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	☑ Yes	☑ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:
☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term
☑ Medium-term
☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:
☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply
☑ Local
☑ Sub-national
☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards
☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections
☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard
☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ External consultants

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

Policy

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Regulators

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The process to determine which dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities could have a substantive financial or strategic impact on the organization is informed by our Enterprise Risk Management committee (“ERC”). The ERC meets quarterly and consists of senior management members in the company including our Chief Financial and Growth Officer (“CFGO”) (Co-Chair), General Counsel (Co-Chair), Chief Counsel & Compliance Officer (“CCCO”), Chief Operations Officer (“COO”), Chief Human Resource Officer (“CHRO”), Chief Information Security Officer (“CISO”) and Global Controller, as well as senior leaders from sustainability, security, audit, and compliance. The ERC and risk management process enables LS&Co. to identify and manage risks entity-wide, improve resource deployment and enhance our enterprise resilience. The top identified risks are then reported to the Audit Committee of the Board at least annually. Separate to the ERC process, underlying climate-related matters are also separately reviewed on a case-by-case basis by our sustainability, supply chain functions, and other stakeholders to understand the level of importance and potential impacts related to brand reputation, operational disruption, supply availability and cost, consumer awareness and regulatory activity. The findings are reviewed with the Executive Leadership Team (“ELT”), as well as the Board of Directors’ Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee at least annually. In 2022, we completed a TCFD aligned climate scenario analysis, identifying climate risks and opportunities across our value chain assessed under 2 time horizons. In 2023, using industry-leading tools and expert guidance, we became one of the first apparel and footwear brands to quantify end-to-end key natural capital impacts and dependencies. This baseline assessment informed the creation of our first-ever biodiversity goal and time-bound supporting targets. We also conduct an annual greenhouse gas inventory to identify, assess, and manage risks and opportunities. For the purposes of defining "substantive financial or strategic impact" when identifying or assessing climate-related risks for this CDP survey: Climate-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term. When evaluating particular climate-related matters, we consider, among other factors, the potential impact on operations, business strategy, cost and availability of raw materials, measurable financial impact that may be one or more percentage points of our annual net revenues, and whether we are able to offset such impact, and the potential for stakeholder or reputational impact. Any one of these elements or a combination thereof could be the basis for determination that a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact. For purposes of evaluating climate-based risks under CDP, we consider the following when determining whether a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact: a 1% or greater impact on our annual net revenues – such as overall product cost increases or significant risk to product availability, resulting in a financial impact of 1% or greater on our annual net revenues. For FY23, our annual net revenues were USD 6.2B, 1% of which is USD 62M.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

Chronic physical

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Regulators

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The process to determine which dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities could have a substantive financial or strategic impact on the organization is informed by our Enterprise Risk Management committee (“ERC”). The ERC meets quarterly and consists of senior management members in the company including our Chief Financial and Growth Officer (“CFGO”) (Co-Chair), General Counsel (Co-Chair), Chief Counsel & Compliance Officer (“CCCO”), Chief Operations Officer (“COO”), Chief Human Resource Officer (“CHRO”), Chief Information Security Officer (“CISO”) and Global Controller, as well as senior leaders from sustainability, security, audit, and compliance. The ERC and risk management process enables LS&Co. to identify and manage risks entity-wide, improve resource deployment and enhance our enterprise resilience. The top identified risks are then reported to the Audit Committee of the Board at least annually. We have an integrated risk assessment approach that looks at both site-level and enterprise-level water risks. In 2023, using industry-leading tools and expert guidance, we became one of the first apparel and footwear brands to quantify end-to-end key natural capital impacts and dependencies. Not surprisingly, dependencies on water resources was a key finding from this work, including ecosystem services such as water filtration, groundwater recharge, and flood control. This baseline assessment informed the creation of our first-ever biodiversity goal and time-bound supporting targets. LS&Co.’s Sustainability team completes a water risk assessment for all of our direct owned & operated (O&O) facilities and our key Tier 1 and Tier 2 suppliers. Facilities and suppliers are categorized as high-water stress if they are located in an area with a high or extremely high ‘Aqueduct Overall Water Risk – Textile’ indicator. Suppliers in areas of high-water stress are assigned stringent absolute water use targets. These targets roll up into our 2025 commitment to reduce our water use in key supplier manufacturing by 50 percent against a 2018 baseline in areas of high-water stress. For the purposes of defining "substantive financial or strategic impact" when identifying or assessing climate-related risks for this CDP survey: Climate-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term. When evaluating particular climate-related matters, we consider, among other factors, the potential impact on operations, business strategy, cost and availability of raw materials, measurable financial impact that may be one or more percentage points of our annual net revenues, and whether we are able to offset such impact, and the potential for stakeholder or reputational impact. Any one of these elements or a combination thereof could be the basis for determination that a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact. For purposes of evaluating climate-based risks under CDP, we consider the following when determining whether a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact: a 1% or greater impact on our annual net revenues – such as overall product cost increases or significant risk to product availability, resulting in a financial impact of 1% or greater on our annual net revenues. For FY23, our annual net revenues were USD 6.2B, 1% of which is USD 62M.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Our climate, water, and biodiversity programs are highly interconnected and overlap in many ways, which allows for many beneficial synergies. For example, our climate risk assessment frequently highlights water availability as a company risk due to our dependency on water for production. Our biodiversity strategy contains a target to support the reduction of freshwater withdrawal pressures and nutrient load pressures in our raw material supply chain.

[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

For Tier 1 and Tier 2 key supplier facilities, suppliers are categorized into areas of low, medium, and high-water stress if they are located in an area with a high or extremely high Aqueduct Overall Water Risk – Textile indicator. “Key suppliers” refer to suppliers covering more than 80% of our global product units.

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

Select from:

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

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

Facility List for 2.3 Response.xlsx
[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For the purposes of defining "substantive financial or strategic impact" when identifying or assessing climate- or water-related risks for this CDP survey: Climate-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term. When evaluating particular climate-related matters, we consider, among other factors, the potential impact on operations, business strategy, cost and availability of raw materials, measurable financial impact that may be one or more percentage points of our annual net revenues, and whether we are able to offset such impact, and the potential for stakeholder or reputational impact. Any one of these elements or a combination thereof could be the basis for determination that a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact. For purposes of evaluating climate-based risks, we consider the following when determining whether a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact: a 1% or greater impact on our annual net revenues – such as overall product cost increases or significant risk to product availability, resulting in a financial impact of 1% or greater on our annual net revenues. For FY23, our annual net revenues were USD 6.2B, 1% of which is USD 62M.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For the purposes of defining "substantive financial or strategic impact" when identifying or assessing climate- or water-related risks for this CDP survey: Climate-related matters are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business over the short-, medium- and long-term. When evaluating particular climate-related matters, we consider, among other factors, the potential impact on operations, business strategy, cost and availability of raw materials, measurable financial impact that may be one or more percentage points of our annual net revenues, and whether we are able to offset such impact, and the potential for stakeholder or reputational impact. Any one of these elements or a combination thereof could be the basis for determination that a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact. For purposes of evaluating climate-based risks, we consider the following when determining whether a climate-based risk may have a substantive financial or strategic impact: a 1% or greater impact on our annual net revenues – such as overall product cost increases or significant risk to product availability, resulting in a financial impact of 1% or greater on our annual net revenues. For FY23, our annual net revenues were USD 6.2B, 1% of which is USD 62M.

[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

LS&Co. has an internal program called Screened Chemistry ("SC") that is designed to understand the potential human and environmental hazards of chemicals before they enter the supply chain. The process incorporates GreenScreen & the U.S. EPA's Safer Choice Program to determine which chemical substances are best in class or better alternatives. Formulations that contain a Benchmark-3 or Benchmark-4 chemical substance (or full green circle on the U.S. EPA SCIL list) are considered preferred substances and will earn a higher score than formulations that contain, for example, Benchmark-1 substances. This scoring system allows us to create a preferred list of chemicals, work with chemical suppliers and garment manufacturers to eliminate chemicals of concern. After aligning with the AFIRM Group (Apparel Footwear Industry RSL Management) RSL for many years, we formally adopted the AFIRM RSL (Restricted Substances List) in 2022. Metrics used in our RSL program include: 1)number of chemicals on the LS&Co. Preferred Chemical List, which encourages our suppliers to use safer alternatives in their manufacturing; 2) number of factories using LS&Co.'s Preferred Chemical List and reporting chemical use to the CleanChain tool; 3) pass rate of suppliers in restricted substances list testing; and 4) pass rate of suppliers in random product testing (at 80% of Tier 1 factories). The indicators used in SC and the ZDHC MRSL are based on measures of ecotoxicity and potential human health hazards.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:
☑ Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Inorganic contaminants impact taste, color, and odor of drinking water. These contaminants are created mainly by dyeing and wastewater treatment processes. This can potentially impact local aquatic ecosystems.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Water recycling
☑ Procedure(s) under development/ R&D
☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods
☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use
☑ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements
☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response
☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The following procedures are in place: Implement ZDHC MRSL / Wastewater Guidelines as industry best practice; Annual on-site assessment of supply chain factories by internal and 3rd party assessors; Expand the water reuse and recycle within the supply chain factories; and Implement Screened Chemistry for continuous hazardous substances elimination. In 2021, we set a goal that all strategic garment wet finishing manufacturing and fabric mills will use 100% certified Screened Chemistry by 2026. These procedures manage risk by providing a robust process to detect concentrations of pollutants above the allowed thresholds and create Corrective Action Plans for suppliers to remediate the issue. Further wastewater testing allows us to be sure that the intended pollution abatement was effective. As part of our wastewater testing reporting, we measure and evaluate success by quantifying the number of in-scope suppliers that register in the ZDHC Gateway Wastewater module.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Other market risk, please specify :Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Mexico

☑ Turkey

☑ Pakistan

☑ Viet Nam

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Apparel production depends on water availability—from growing cotton to manufacturing to consumer care at home. If global cotton production fell or water became more expensive due to climate change, the price of cotton could rise, which, could drive up our production costs. Using the WRI Aqueduct tool, we found that as of 2023, about 30 of our key suppliers are in "high water stress" areas. A life cycle assessment (LCA) revealed that nearly 70% of water withdrawals occur in the fiber phase (e.g., cotton growing) and about 6% in fabric production. Our 2022 scenario modeling indicated similar high risks from climate change. The modelling indicated that there may be some initial short-term benefits to cotton due to warming temperatures and rising CO2 concentrations but that these would diminish over time towards 2050, and we are likely to see an increase in acute weather events that will negatively impact cotton production. Consequently, our supply chain faces significant physical risks from climate change, including unpredictable rain patterns, decreased precipitation, rising temperatures, and extended droughts, etc. These risks can threaten the availability of freshwater critical to our supplier mills, laundries and factories as well as the farms that provide the material basis for our products, specifically cotton. Cotton is grown in some of the most arid regions in the world, and climate change can significantly impact cotton availability, quality, and pricing.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

Potential financial impacts from chronic changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns are related to increased cost of raw materials, specifically cotton, which represents a key component of our manufacturing costs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

93100000

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

93100000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*Potential financial impacts from chronic changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns are related to increased cost of raw materials, specifically cotton, which represents a key component of our manufacturing costs. Cotton costs may increase due to decreased cotton supply or increased cost of water needed for cotton growing. A study from the World Bank estimated that by 2035, production-weighted price for cotton would likely increase by 7% compared to 2023. For this estimation, we are taking a very conservative approach and assuming this cotton price increase within a 1-year period. Further, we use an apparel industry average, assuming raw materials, such as cotton, generally represent about half of the cost of goods sold (COGS), with variations driven by the materials, product specifications, production regions and quantity purchased. To estimate the potential financial impact as a result of climate-related cotton price increases, a 7% cotton price increase was applied to half (50%) of LS&Co.'s COGS as of FY23 [7%*50%*USD 2.66 B equals USD 93.1M]. The resulting estimate represents the maximum potential impact for one fiscal year, assumes elevated cotton prices are in place for the entire year, there is no other supply chain disruption, and no mitigating actions are taken. This estimated potential financial impact is highly dependent on other external forces and sourcing strategy and is subsequently subject to change.*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Increased use of sustainably sourced materials

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

LS&Co.'s suppliers purchase cotton on a global scale and ensure redundancy within our supply chain to reduce potential risks associated with supply chain disruptions, including those caused by weather variability and other climate related issues. Consistent with our overall risk mitigation strategy, our supply chain is designed to be resilient. Although cotton commodity prices decreased in 2023 compared to 2022, any future cost increases would be absorbed into business-as-usual activities and are considered in LS&Co.'s financial plans, therefore we have listed 0 as the cost of response to risk.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Case study: Situation: LS&Co.'s suppliers purchase cotton on a global scale and ensures redundancy within our supply chain to reduce potential risks associated with supply chain disruptions, including those caused by weather variability and other climate related issues. Consistent with our overall risk mitigation strategy, our supply chain is designed to be resilient. Although cotton commodity prices decreased in 2023 compared to 2022, any future cost increases would be absorbed into business-as-usual activities and are considered in LS&Co.'s financial plans. Task: Given that approximately 89 percent of LS&Co. products are cotton-based, the sustainability of our cotton supply and possible new solutions to address this raw material's impact- including, water used in cotton agriculture, irrigation and runoff, use of pesticides and farmer education- were considered. Cotton agriculture accounts for nearly 70 percent of the water used during the lifecycle of a pair of jeans (per life cycle assessment). Action: To further manage a variety of risks cotton poses in our supply chain, in 2021, LS&Co. ran a pilot with US Cotton Trust Protocol (USCTP) to test our compatibility with their systems and enroll several of our Americas-based suppliers into the program. Result: At the end of 2023, approximately 96 percent *of our cotton was sourced from Better Cotton Initiative (BCI) farmers, organic cotton farms, or recycled cotton suppliers, and we intend to reach 100 percent certified or sustainably sourced cotton by 2025.*

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Narmada

☑ Tapti River

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Apparel production depends heavily on water availability, from growing cotton to manufacturing to consumer care at home. The WRI Aqueduct tool found that approximately 25% of our key suppliers are located in geographies considered "high water stress". Based on a life cycle analysis (LCA), in general, nearly 70% of water withdrawals occur in the fiber phase (e.g., cotton growing) while approximately 6% occur in the fabric production phase. Additionally, our 2022 completed scenario modeling indicated a similar high risk from climate change. The modeling indicated some initial short-term benefits to cotton due to warming temperatures and rising CO2 concentrations but that these would diminish over time towards 2050, and we are likely to see an increase in acute weather events negatively impact cotton production. Therefore, our supply chain is potentially exposed to significant physical risks from climate change, including unpredictable rain patterns and rising temperatures. All of these risks threaten the availability of freshwater critical to our mills, laundries, and factories as well as the farms that provide the material basis for our products. Cotton is grown in some of the most arid regions in the world, and climate change can significantly impact availability, quality, and pricing. If global production were to fall or water were to become more expensive as a result of climate change, the price of cotton could go up, which, in turn, could drive up our production costs.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Potential financial impacts from chronic changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns are related to increased cost of raw materials, specifically cotton, which represents a key component of our manufacturing costs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

21000000

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

21000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*To estimate the potential financial impact as a result of water-related cotton price increases, we first assumed a 7% cotton price increase; for the purposes of this estimation, we are taking a very conservative approach and assuming this cotton price increase within a 1 year period. That price increase was applied to half (50%) of LS&Co.'s COGS for FY23 [7%*50%*USD 2.66 B equals USD 93M]. However, this assumes that cotton production and prices will be impacted globally at the same levels, rather than at a country-level. According to India's Ministry of Textiles, India is responsible for 23% of total cotton production. We assume, for this calculation, that LS&Co. cotton sourcing per country is roughly proportional to total cotton production per country. Expanding on the calculation above, that estimated potential cotton price increases on a global level, here we assume that a water-driven event in India would result in roughly 23% of the overall price increase. USD 93M * 23% equals USD 21M The resulting estimate represents the maximum of potential impact for one fiscal year, assumes elevated cotton prices are in place for the entire year, and no other supply chain disruption or no mitigating actions are taken. This estimated potential financial impact is highly dependent on other external forces and sourcing strategy and is subsequently subject to change.*

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Increased use of sustainably sourced materials

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

35000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Annual brand membership fees for BCI are 35K USD

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our continued promotion and support for The Better Cotton Initiative (BCI), US Cotton Trust Protocol, and Organic Cotton Accelerator empowers cotton farmers to increase their yields through less water and less chemical use and invest in regenerative farming techniques. In 2023, 96% of our Cotton was organic, recycled or Better Cotton.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :India East Coast

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain

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

7

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

3

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify **:**Arabian Sea Coast

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations
☑ Upstream value chain

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

13

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

9

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

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

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

3

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :India South Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :India West Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Krishna

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

5

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Mahi River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

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

19

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

12

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Verde

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

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

2

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

2

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 12

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 13

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Tigris & Euphrates

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 14

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Bangladesh

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 15

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Other, please specify :East Brazil, South Atlantic Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 16

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java-Timor

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.

Row 17

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Peru
☑ Other, please specify **:**Pacific Coast

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.2.11) Please explain

We do not disclose net revenue detail disaggregated by our supply chain facilities.
[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Poland carbon tax

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

Poland carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/01/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

11/30/2023

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

22

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

1300

(3.5.3.5) Comment

LS&Co.'s strategy for compliance across our global portfolio is to stay aware of current and emerging regulations and ensure we have systems and processes in place to comply with energy or emissions regulations. For the factory we owned in Poland, we tracked and reported emissions from stationary and mobile combustion on an annual basis, in order to comply with the Poland Carbon Tax.

[Fixed row]

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

LSandCo.'s strategy for compliance across our global portfolio is to stay aware of current and emerging regulations and ensure we have systems and processes in place to comply with energy or emissions regulations. For example, for our factory in Poland, we tracked and reported emissions from stationary and mobile combustion on an annual basis, in order to comply with the Poland Carbon Tax. We have applied this strategy by calculating emissions from our Poland factory to comply with the Poland Carbon Tax, as it is legal requirement. The factory has limits designated in a permit and these limits were met on an annual basis. While not all substances are listed in the permit (i.e., emissions are not limited), there is still a fee associated with emissions from all sources. For example, carbon dioxide is not limited, but LS&Co. pays a fee for these emissions. Additionally, our factory in Plock, Poland, is key to achieving our science-based GHG target. As a result, we upgraded 90% of our lighting to LED lights as of FY 2018, and in 2021 through 2022 upgraded another 70 lamps. We estimate energy savings to be 750 MWh/year for the full system, and, in 2018, the factory received an award from the Polish National Energy Conservation Agency for energy efficiency efforts [PY]. However, the company decided to close this Poland factory in 2024. LSandCo. believes government leadership is essential for widespread action to address climate change and create the enabling environment for companies like ours to invest in renewable energy and achieve the greatest savings from energy efficiency. We can do more, faster and cheaper with state and federal legislation that incentivizes us to capture efficiencies, invest in renewable energy, and reduce GHG emissions. The reduced business costs from these investments are savings we can reinvest in the company to grow our business and create jobs. Put simply, we can run our business better with the certainty of a price on carbon and government policies and incentives to help us to maximize energy efficiency and draw our energy from renewable sources. Our Policy and Advocacy team monitors current and emerging regulations that may impact business and operations. The expected magnitude of the risks driven by regulations are low to moderate and the likelihood is about as likely as not. We assess risks from emerging regulations as part of our regular sustainability-related materiality assessments.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency
☑ Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify :Participation in renewable energy programs, adoption of energy- and water-efficiency measures

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

LS&Co. recognizes that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are a major contributor to global climate change. If left unchecked, these emissions will trigger large- scale economic, social, and environmental consequences for our business and the communities in which we operate. Within our operations globally, we are committed to reducing our energy use and related GHG emissions. Based on a 2017 assessment, we have determined we can achieve 100 percent renewable electricity in our owned and leased operations by 2025 through deployment of a combination of renewable electricity options to optimize cost, performance, and impact across regions. As of 2023, LS&Co. has achieved over 97 percent of our total electricity as renewable. Our path toward 100 percent renewable electricity includes: (1) implementing energy efficiency measures globally, (2) transitioning to renewable energy sources, including implementing onsite solar and investing in power purchase agreements (PPAs & VPPAs), and (3) purchasing renewable energy certificates (RECs). In 2022, LS&Co. implemented a sizeable LED lighting replacement project in the UK distribution center that is anticipated to yield annual energy savings of almost 240 MWh. In 2023, we expanded the LED lighting replacement project to external lighting at the same UK distribution center, which is estimated to reduce electricity usage by 15%.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term

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

Select from:
☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium-low

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

Potential financial impacts from implementing energy efficiency measures are related to annual savings in electricity usage. Select LS&Co. facilities were assessed for the LED lighting rollout and HVAC upgrade initiative to estimate financial impact.

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1000000

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

10000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Potential financial impacts from implementing energy efficiency measures are related to annual savings in electricity usage across identified energy efficiency initiatives with a payback period of less than 3 years as identified in LS&Co.'s 2017 study of renewable energy and energy efficiency opportunities. The study looked at LS&Co.'s owned and operated plants, retail locations, distribution centers, and offices and included initiatives such as LED lighting rollouts and HVAC upgrades. The low end of the range represents one year of annual savings (USD 1 million) and the high-end of the range assumes these savings are continually realized for a 10-year period (10 million). Therefore, the formula is USD 1M x 10-year period equals USD 10M. This estimated potential financial impact range is based on professional judgment and is subsequently subject to change.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

3000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize this opportunity (USD 3M) is based on capital cost estimates from LS&Co.'s 2017 study of RE and energy efficiency projects with a payback period of less than 2.5 years. The majority of the USD 3M capital cost estimate is related to LED upgrades. These initiatives address multiple risks and opportunities, but since we are unable to allocate across all risks and opportunities, we have reported the full estimated cost.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Situation: LS&Co. recognizes that GHG emissions are a major contributor to global climate change. If left unchecked, emissions will trigger large-scale economic, social, and environmental consequences for our business and communities in which we operate. Task: We have targeted energy efficiency projects in our offices, retail stores, and distribution centers including lighting upgrades, HVAC upgrades, and deployment of energy management system upgrades. We track global emissions/water data to identify hotspots and prioritize locations for energy and water efficiency initiatives. The cost to realize this opportunity (USD 3M) is based on capital cost estimates from LS&Co.'s 2017 study of RE and energy efficiency projects with a payback period of less than 2.5 years. The majority of the USD 3M capital cost estimate relates to LED upgrades. Initiatives address multiple risks and opportunities, but since we are unable to allocate across all risks and opportunities, we have reported the full estimated cost. Action: In 2022, we participated in a first-of-its-kind aggregated supply chain initiative, virtual purchasing power agreement ("VPPA"), which is projected to commission enough RE to power 100% of LS&Co.'s U.S. energy load through 2035. We partnered with 6 other Walmart suppliers to pool our operational energy demand and co-finance the construction of a wind farm in Kansas through a long-term, fixed-rate offtake agreement. This is an opportunity to reduce our long-term operating costs as well as an opportunity to enhance our reputation and improve the resiliency of our operations. Result: To achieve, our science based GHG target, we upgraded 90% of lighting to LED at our Plock, Poland facility. We saved approximately 750 MWh/year for the system, and in 2018 the factory received an award from the PNECA. In 2020, we installed solar panels in our Henderson, NV distribution center providing about 20% of its electricity needs. The building was certified Platinum LEED and was the largest DC to receive that accreditation at the time. This upgrade helps to maintain its LEED Platinum status, making it the 1st facility in the apparel industry and 2nd in the US with such a certification. In 2021, we performed LED replacements at our MS *and UK distribution center, saving a projected combined about 240,000 kWh. However, the company decided to close our Poland factory and our distribution center in Canton, MS in 2024. As of 2023, 97% of our total electricity was renewable.*

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Mexico
☑ Turkey
☑ Pakistan
☑ Viet Nam

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Tigris & Euphrates

☑ Verde

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast; Ziya He, Interior; Sabarmat; Arabian Sea Coast; India East Coast

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

While we have demonstrated leadership through our efforts in our own operations, we are also aware that the apparel industry's biggest water impact is in the supply chain. Over the last several years we have piloted innovative programs aimed at reducing our environmental impact in the supply chain and are excited by the results and the opportunity to scale those programs. For example, in 2017, we piloted the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Partnership for Cleaner Textile (PaCT) program. Through IFC's PaCT approach, as of 2023 IFC is working with around 60 designated LS&Co. suppliers and mills to reduce water usage by helping suppliers identify and implement appropriate renewable energy and water saving interventions across 15 countries. Between 2017 – 2021, participating suppliers have been able to reduce water and energy by an estimated annual average of 4% and 7%, respectively, and save USD 4 million in operating costs. LS&Co., and the apparel industry at large, source products in many developing countries where water is scarce. With climate change promising to alter precipitation, induce more severe droughts and intensify water scarcity, there exists a clear window of opportunity to help our manufacturers reduce their dependence on threatened local water supplies by implementing systems that recycle and reuse water. This self-sufficiency at the manufacturing level diminishes water availability risks, allows for stable production and long-term cost savings.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

To meet our corporate sustainability objectives to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and water use in our supply chain, in 2018, Levi Strauss & Co. signed a USD 2 million cooperation agreement with the International Finance Corporation (IFC), a member of the World Bank Group, in which LS&Co. is responsible for USD 1 M as part of IFC's Partnership for Cleaner Textiles (PaCT) approach. During the one-year pilot in 2017, we helped 6 participating suppliers save more than USD 1 million in their operating costs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1000000

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

10000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*Through IFC's PaCT approach, IFC has worked with around 60 designated LS&Co. suppliers and mills to reduce water withdrawals by helping suppliers identify and implement appropriate water saving interventions across 15 countries. The project follows the success of a 2017 pilot between the two organizations. During the one-year pilot, we helped participating 6 suppliers save more than USD 1 million in their operating costs. The low-end of the reported financial impact range assumes no additional cost savings beyond the approximate savings achieved through the pilot project (USD 1M). The high end reported potential financial impact figure assumes that decreased operating costs from the pilot program will be representative of the cost savings achieved by the additional suppliers designated for the program. Given that this program was piloted with approximately 10% of the total designated suppliers (conservatively, we assume 10%, though the pilot covered 1/7th of the total designated suppliers), we estimate the total cost reduction could be 10x that achieved by the pilot, resulting in approximately USD 10 million in savings (USD 1M*10 equals USD 10M). This estimated potential financial impact range is based on professional judgment and is subject to change.*

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

To meet our corporate sustainability objectives to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and water use in our supply chain, in 2018 Levi Strauss & Co. signed a USD 2 million cooperation agreement with the International Finance Corporation (IFC), a member of the World Bank Group, in which LS&Co. is responsible for USD 1M as part of IFC's Partnership for Cleaner Textiles (PaCT) approach. Therefore, the cost calculation to realize this opportunity is USD 2 million/2 equals USD 1 million.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Case Study: Situation: LS&Co. has included suppliers in its science-based target (SBT) with a goal to reduce absolute Scope 3 emissions from purchased goods and services 42 percent by 2030 from a 2022 base-year. Task: To meet our corporate sustainability objectives to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and water use in our supply chain, Levi Strauss & Co. signed a USD 2 million cooperation agreement with the International Finance Corporation (IFC), a member of the World Bank Group, in which LS&Co. is responsible for USD 1 M as part of IFC's Partnership for Cleaner Textiles (PaCT) approach. Therefore, the cost calculation to realize this opportunity is USD 2 million/2 equals USD 1 million. IFC is working with around 60 designated LS&Co. suppliers and mills to reduce GHG emissions by helping suppliers identify and implement appropriate renewable energy and water saving interventions across 15 countries. Action: IFC is working with around 60 designated LS&Co. suppliers and mills to reduce GHG emissions by helping suppliers identify and implement appropriate renewable energy and water saving interventions across 15 countries. Result: Between 2017 – 2021, participating suppliers have been able to reduce water and energy by an estimated annual average of 4% and 7%, respectively, and save USD 4 million in operating costs. These initiatives serve as a key component in LS&Co.'s strategy to optimize production capacity by reducing resource demands for engaged suppliers.

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

In conducting its assessment of board candidates, the Board considers diversity (including, among other things, race, ethnicity, cultural background, gender, geography, sexual orientation and areas of expertise), age, skills, integrity, strength of character, judgment and other factors that it deems appropriate to maintain a balance of knowledge, experience and capability on the Board. Additionally, the Board is committed to actively seeking out diverse candidates, including qualified women and individuals from minority and other groups described above, to include in the pool from which nominees for the Board are selected. (Last paragraph of section D.1 in the attachment)

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

levi-strauss-corporate-governance-guidelines-ffinal.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply
☑ Board-level committee
☑ Other, please specify :Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board mandate

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Levi Strauss & Co. has multiple board committees with responsibility for oversight of climate and water-related issues. This includes the Nominating, Governance & Corporate Citizenship Committee, the Audit Committee, and the Compensation and Human Capital Committee. The Board of Directors' Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee assists the board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities on corporate governance and corporate citizenship matters, which include, but are not limited climate-related issues. The Chief Sustainability Officer and/or COO report to the Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee at *least quarterly on climate and sustainability issues, including updates on climate-related goals, progress made and other matters. The Audit Committee reviews major financial risk exposures, and the steps management has taken to monitor and control such exposures. In this context, management engages with the Audit Committee and the Board concerning risk, both periodically and annually. The VP of Global Security and Resilience reports the results of the annual risk survey, which includes climate and water related risks, to the Board of Directors' Audit Committee. The Audit Committee also provides assistance to our Board of Directors in its oversight of the integrity of our financial statements and disclosures related to environment, health and safety, corporate citizenship, public policy and community involvement ("ESG"), accounting and financial reporting processes, systems of internal control over financial reporting and compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. The Compensation and Human Capital Committee is responsible for the oversight of our human capital management, diversity, equity and inclusion efforts and compensation.*

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

☑ Other, please specify **:**Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board mandate

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Levi Strauss & Co. has multiple board committees with responsibility for oversight of climate and water-related issues. This includes the Nominating, Governance & Corporate Citizenship Committee, the Audit Committee, and the Compensation and Human Capital Committee. The Board of Directors' Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee assists the board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities on corporate governance matters, which includes, but is not limited to climate-related issues. The Chief Sustainability Officer and/or COO report to the Nominating, Governance and Corporate Citizenship Committee at least quarterly on climate and sustainability issues, including updates on climate-related goals, progress made and other matters. The Audit Committee reviews major financial risk exposures, and the steps management has taken to monitor and control such exposures. In this context, management engages with the Audit Committee and the Board concerning risk, both periodically and annually. The VP of Global Security and Resilience reports the results of the annual risk survey, which include climate change, to the Board of Directors' Audit Committee. The Audit Committee also provides assistance to our Board of Directors in its oversight of the integrity of our financial statements and disclosures related to environment, health and safety, corporate citizenship, public policy and community involvement ("ESG"), accounting and financial reporting processes, systems of internal control over financial reporting and compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. The Compensation and Human Capital Committee is responsible for the oversight of our human capital management, diversity, equity and inclusion efforts and compensation.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Additional training

☑ Training in an environmental subject by a certified organization, please specify :In 2023, one member of our board attended a climate training program through Michigan Ross School of Business.

Experience

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Additional training

☑ Training in an environmental subject by a certified organization, please specify :In 2023, one member of our board attended a climate and water training program through Michigan Ross School of Business.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

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

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

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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Operating Officer (COO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Our President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) holds the highest responsibility for climate and water-related risks and opportunities below the board level and provides direction to the EVP and Chief Operations Officer (COO), to whom the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) reports. Our CSO is eligible for incentive compensation for the effective management of sustainability issues. As a specific example, the CSO has an absolute operational greenhouse gas emissions reductions target and a renewable energy procurement target (as a percentage of absolute operational energy use) built into his individual performance objectives. Climate-related issues are monitored through many corporate initiatives, including Better Cotton purchasing, monthly policy update meetings, absolute greenhouse *gas (GHG) and energy targets, regenerative cotton sourcing, etc... Our CSO reports quarterly to the Board on a range of topics which may include progress towards our climate targets. To ensure the company's policy actions are aligned with business strategies, including our climate and energy objectives, there is a monthly leadership meeting on policy, which includes the CEO, CFGO, General Counsel, Chief Counsel, Chief Communications Officer, COO, CSO and Head of Global Policy and Advocacy. This ensures that even in a dynamic policy environment, executives have an opportunity to confirm that LS&Co.'s policy activities support all aspects of the corporate strategy, including climate issues. In addition, the CSO is engaged in multiple meetings with senior leadership, and family and institutional investors on a regular basis to discuss approaches and progress toward the LS&Co. Science Based targets (SBTs). Supporting programs and initiatives are managed by accountable functions in the organization including but not limited to global sustainability, product development and sourcing, product design, finance, marketing and commercial.*

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:
☑ Reports to the Chief Operating Officer (COO)

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

Select from:
☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Our President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) holds the highest responsibility for climate and water-related risks and opportunities below the board level and provides direction to the EVP and Chief Operations Officer (COO), to whom the Chief Sustainability Officer reports into. Our Chief Sustainability Officer is eligible for incentive compensation for the effective management of sustainability issues. As a specific example, the Chief Sustainability Officer has an absolute supply chain water reduction target built into his individual performance objectives. Water-related issues are monitored through many corporate initiatives, including monthly policy update meetings, absolute water reduction targets, and the construction of a new sustainable Distribution Center in the EU. Our Chief Sustainability Officer reports quarterly to the Board on a range of topics which may include progress towards our water targets. To ensure the company's policy actions are aligned with business strategies, including our water objectives, there is a monthly leadership meeting on policy, which includes the CEO, CFGO, General Counsel, Chief Counsel, Chief Communications Officer, COO, Chief Sustainability Officer and Head of Global Policy and Advocacy. This ensures that even in a dynamic policy environment, executives have an opportunity to confirm that the company's policy activities support all aspects of the corporate strategy, including water issues. In addition, the Chief Sustainability Officer is engaged in multiple meetings with senior leadership, and family and institutional investors on a regular basis to discuss approaches and progress toward the LS&Co.'s water reduction target. Supporting programs and initiatives are managed by accountable functions in the organization including but not limited to global sustainability, product development and sourcing, product design, finance, marketing and commercial.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.3) Please explain

Certain employees are eligible for incentive compensation for the effective management of sustainability issues. LS&Co. bases each employee's annual bonus allocation on a combination of company and individual performance. Individual performance is assessed against annual objectives, which for certain employees includes effective management of sustainability issues, including climate-related issues.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.3) Please explain

Certain employees are eligible for incentive compensation for the effective management of sustainability issues. LS&Co. bases each employee's annual bonus allocation on a combination of company and individual performance. Individual performance is assessed against annual objectives, which for certain employees includes effective management of sustainability issues, including water-related issues.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

LS&Co.'s Chief Sustainability Officer has the accountability and responsibility for achievement of our 2025 greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets, by leading the teams across the value chain focused on GHG reductions, investments and accounting built into their annual individual performance objectives.

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

Helps ensure accountability across the organization for achieving our targets and necessary prioritization of resources to address GHG and renewable energy year over year targets.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

☑ Reduction of water withdrawal and/or consumption volumes – upstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – upstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

Pollution

☑ Improvements in wastewater quality – downstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

☑ Reduction of water pollution incidents

Policies and commitments

☑ Increased access to workplace WASH – upstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

LS&Co.'s COO has accountability for achievement of our 2025 water reduction targets in water stressed geographies built into the annual individual performance objectives. The Chief Sustainability Officer has the accountability and responsibility for achievement of our 2025 water reduction targets in water stressed *geographies, by leading the teams across the value chain focused on water reductions, investments and accounting built into their annual individual performance objectives.*

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

Helps ensure accountability across the organization for achieving our targets and necessary prioritization of resources to address water targets.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The 2025 Climate Action Strategy is a roadmap for what we plan to do and how we plan to do it – and we hope it will inspire others across our industry to join us. These ambitious targets are approved by the Science Based Targets Initiative and aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement, which continues to have our unwavering support. As a company, we are committed to advocating for strong climate policies and taking significant action to reduce our climate impact. It includes details on our carbon footprint and strategy for Owned-and-Operated facilities, Global Supply Chain, and Customer Use and Disposal.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

☑ Commitment to not invest in fossil-fuel expansion

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :- 100% renewable electricity in all owned-and-operated facilities by 2025. - 42% absolute reduction in GHG emissions across our scope 3, category 1 – apparel by 2030 over a 2022 base year.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

LSCO_Climate_Action_Strategy_2025.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

We recently set a SBTi-approved 2050 net zero target that includes modified Scopes 1, 2, and 3 targets. Transitioning out of coal into renewable energy is critical to achieving decarbonization. Our SBTi-approved goal of reducing absolute emissions of scope 1 and 2 emissions by 90% by 2025, over a 2016 baseline, remains the same. We are still committed to 100% renewable energy in our owned-and-operated facilities by 2025.Our SBTi-approved Scope 3 goal has been updated to target a 42% Scope 3 absolute emissions reduction by 2030, from a baseline year of 2022. In 2023 we implemented a Supply Chain Low Carbon Fuel Transition Policy1 requiring our key suppliers to transition to low carbon fuels by 2030.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

A Renewed Climate Commitment - Levi Strauss & Co _ Levi Strauss & Co.pdf

Row 3

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our publicly available water policies provide details on our water-related impacts and dependencies and state our company water targets and goals aimed at reducing water use and improving the quality of our wastewater. Details of these initiatives can be easily located in our Sustainability Report and in our 2025 Water Action Strategy. Our Sustainability Report and 2025 Water Action Strategy describe in detail our business dependency on water, (primarily from growing cotton), our contextual water targets and goals that we have set for 2025, our commitment to water stewardship and collective action through the Water Resilience Coalition, and the acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation through our partnership with Waves for Water. We also have a 2020 Sustainability Guidebook that outlines the requirements that our suppliers must meet in terms of topics like water use and water recycling. We have commitments to various global water initiatives – CEO Water Mandate, Water Resilience Coalition, and UN SDGs for example – that have helped develop our policies, targets, and goals at LS&Co. Our water-related standards and practices are made publicly available both to help hold us accountable for meeting our goals and to help our peers develop more advanced water stewardship initiatives. We recognize that access to high quality water is an essential human right and believe that water stewardship is vital in mitigating climate change.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

Select all that apply

☑ No, but we plan to align in the next two years

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

2019_LSCO_WATER_STRATEGY_REPORT.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ CEO Water Mandate
☑ We Are Still In
☑ Water Resilience Coalition
☑ Better Cotton Initiative (BCI)
☑ Sustainable Apparel Coalition (SAC)
☑ Partnership for Cleaner Textile (PaCT)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC)
☑ Other, please specify **:Fashion Charter for Climate Action**

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

Fashion Charter for Climate Action: LS&Co. signed on to the Fashion Industry Charter for Climate Action in 2018 during the COP24 conference. We have been active participants in working groups to make this charter actionable and impactful. We Are Still In: LS&Co. was among the first wave of companies to sign on to the We Are Still In coalition in 2017 after the Trump administration withdrew from the Paris Agreement. We reaffirmed that commitment in 2020 by signing on to the 'We Are All In statement' and pledged to partner with fellow coalition members and the Biden-Harris administration to tackle the climate crisis. https://www.levistrauss.com/2020/12/10/recognition-and-the-path-forward-climate-action/ Water Resilience Coalition: We are a proud member of the CEO Water Mandate and the Water Resilience Coalition.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

☑ Yes, we engaged indirectly through, and/or provided financial or in-kind support to a trade association or other intermediary organization or individual whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Business Support Statement for the Inflation Reduction Act.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

LS&Co.'s organizational structure requires close collaboration across key departments. Our Sustainability function works with business leaders from across the company (including Global Policy and Advocacy) to evaluate, reassess and build alignment on the Company's Climate Action Strategy 2025, ensuring strong integration into the business. In order to ensure all of LS&Co.'s policy activities are aligned with business strategies, including our climate and energy objectives, LS&Co. holds monthly cross-functional policy meetings, which include the CEO, CFGO, General Counsel, Chief Communications Officer, Head of Global Policy and Advocacy, and when applicable, the Chief Sustainability Officer, who oversees the sustainability function. This ensures that even in a dynamic policy environment, executives have an opportunity to confirm the Company's policy activity supports all aspects of the company's strategy, including climate and water. If an inconsistency is found between the Company's policy activity and the internal climate or water strategies, these cross-functional policy meetings would be an opportunity to adjust course.

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

Inflation Reduction Act

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Energy and renewables
☑ Renewable energy generation

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

Select from:
☑ National

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

Select all that apply
☑ Americas

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

Select from:
☑ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply
☑ Ad-hoc meetings

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

0

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

In 2022, LS&Co. advocated for ambitious clean energy solutions and other climate-related provisions included in the Inflation Reduction Act. LS&Co. joined the Lawmaker Education and Advocacy Day (LEAD) on Climate, hosted by Ceres BICEP to engage lawmakers on the importance of investing in clean energy. In addition, working with other member companies in the BICEP coalition, we advocated for policies that advance development of clean energy generation and opposed policies that would create barriers for clean energy. For example, LS&Co. joined a business letter regarding federal clean energy investments in April 2022, LS&Co. CEO Chip Bergh signed a letter to Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi to finalize and promptly pass a critical climate and clean energy package in July 2022. LS&Co. also signed a business statement of support for the Inflation Reduction Act in August 2022. Proposed legislative solution: LS&Co. believes government leadership is essential for widespread action to address climate change and create the enabling environment for companies like ours to invest in renewable energy and achieve the greatest savings from energy efficiency. We can do more, faster and cheaper with state and federal legislation that incentivizes us to capture efficiencies, invest in renewable energy, and reduce GHG emissions. The reduced business costs from these investments are savings we can reinvest in the company to grow our business and create jobs. Put simply, we can run our business better with the certainty of a price on carbon and government policies and incentives to help us to maximize energy efficiency and draw our energy from renewable sources.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year.

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :UNFCCC Fashion Charter

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization’s position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual’s position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization’s position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual’s position, and any actions taken to influence their position

LS&Co. and the UNFCCC Fashion Charter are aligned with the goals of the Paris Climate Change Agreement and moving towards net-zero emissions by 2050.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

20000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

LS&Co. is a signatory to the United Nations Fashion Industry Charter for Climate Action to explore policy solutions in key sourcing countries.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :Cascale (formerly Sustainable Apparel Coalition, or SAC)

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

Cascale (formerly Sustainable Apparel Coalition, or SAC) is the apparel, footwear, and textile industry's leading alliance for sustainable production. The Sustainable Apparel Coalition's vision is of an apparel, footwear, and textiles industry that produces no unnecessary environmental harm and has a positive impact on the people and communities associated with its activities. One of the primary metrics that it scores companies on is climate change impacts. LS&Co. has a representative on the Board of Cascale and a representative on the Policy Hub. The Policy Hub is working to provide a menu of policy options to the European Parliament to support the transition to a more circular apparel economy.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

54000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

LS&Co. promotes Cascale's vision of an apparel, footwear, and textiles industry that produces no unnecessary environmental harm and has a positive impact on the people and communities associated with its activities. One of the primary metrics that it scores companies on is climate change impacts.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization’s engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

11,12,14,17, 19, 22, (page numbers as they are printed in the 10K)

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

02282024-2023-annual-report_screen-v3.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

2023 annual report: https://s23.q4cdn.com/172692177/files/doc_financials/2023/ar/02282024-2023-annual-report_screen-v3.pdf

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Underway - previous year attached

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

6-18, 24, 26

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2022-LSCo.-Sustainability-Goals-Progress-Update.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Sustainability Goals Progress: https://www.levistrauss.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2022-LSCo.-Sustainability-Goals-Progress-Update.pdf

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

1-10

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

LSCO_Climate_Action_Strategy_2025.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

LS&CO. Climate Action Strategy: https://www.levistrauss.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/LSCO_Climate_Action_Strategy_2025.pdf

Row 4

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Value chain engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

11, 14, 19

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

02282024-2023-annual-report_screen-v3.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

2023 annual report: https://s23.q4cdn.com/172692177/files/doc_financials/2023/ar/02282024-2023-annual-report_screen-v3.pdf

Row 5

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Strategy
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

12

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2022-LSCo.-Sustainability-Goals-Progress-Update.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

n/a
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

LS&Co. considered a rapid transition scenario characterized by stringent climate policies and major shifts to markets and technology. The timeframe evaluated was 2030 and 2050. The transition scenarios were inclusive of all our brands, across 9 selected geographies and included assessment across the value chain from raw material production, manufacturing, and own operations. Risks and opportunities were evaluated across the following risk and opportunity types: Market, Policy, Technology, Reputation, Legal, Resource efficiency, Energy source, Products and services, Markets, and Resilience. Assessment was based on a range of source data including primary data informing the scenario assessment regarding product units, sourcing and supplier base geographies, emissions, supply chain stages, and revenue models. The rapid transition model was built on a range of external datasets from International Energy Agency, regional and national and sector specific scenarios, projections and strategies, industry outlooks, scientific papers, and country level scenario studies. Through this work we identified 25 hotspots which were then prioritized with senior leadership into top transition risks and opportunities.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

IEA Net Zero 2050 was selected as the most well-known and widely used transition scenarios for conducting TCFD-aligned transition assessments. Includes policy implementation aligned with the Paris Agreement and warming of approximately 1.5 degrees C by end-century.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

LS&Co. considered a high physical impact climate change scenario that brings significant changes to climate and weather conditions. Developed utilizing an RCP 8.5 aligned 4C warming by 2100. The timeframe evaluated was 2030 and 2050. The transition scenarios were inclusive of all our brands, across 9 selected geographies and included assessment across the value chain from raw material production, manufacturing, and own operations. Risks and opportunities were evaluated across the following risk and opportunity types: Market, Policy, Technology, Reputation, Legal, Resource efficiency, Energy source, Products and services, Markets, and Resilience. Assessment was based on a range of source data including primary data informing the scenario assessment regarding product units, sourcing and supplier base geographies, emissions, supply chain stages, and revenue models. The rapid transition model was built on a range of external datasets from NASAs NEX- GDDP, GCM and CMIP5. Through this work we identified 25 hotspots which were then prioritized with senior leadership into top physical risks and opportunities.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

As part of our FY22 direct operations water risk assessment, we conducted a climate-related scenario analysis. Using the WRI Aqueduct tool, we evaluated changes in future water stress in 2030 and 2040 assuming a business-as-usual scenario, SSP2 RCP 8.5, defined by Aqueduct as a world with stable economic development and steadily rising global carbon emissions, with CO2 concentrations reaching approximately 1370 ppm by 2100 and global mean temperatures increasing by 4.0C. IEA Net Zero 2050: Most well-known and widely used transition scenarios for conducting TCFD-aligned transition assessments. Includes policy implementation aligned with the Paris Agreement and warming of approximately 1.5 degrees C by end-century.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

LS&Co. considered a high physical impact climate change scenario that brings significant changes to climate and weather conditions. Developed utilizing an RCP 8.5 aligned 4C warming by 2100. The timeframe evaluated was 2030 and 2050. The transition scenarios were inclusive of all our brands, across 9 selected geographies and included assessment across the value chain from raw material production, manufacturing, and own operations. Risks and opportunities were evaluated across the following risk and opportunity types: Market, Policy, Technology, Reputation, Legal, Resource efficiency, Energy source, Products and services, Markets, and Resilience. Assessment was based on a range of source data including primary data informing the scenario assessment regarding product units, sourcing and supplier base geographies, emissions, supply chain stages, and revenue models. The rapid transition model was built on a range of external datasets from NASAs NEX- GDDP, GCM and CMIP5. Through this work we identified 25 hotspots which were then prioritized with senior leadership into top physical risks and opportunities.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

RCP 8.5 (4C) was selected assumes almost no mitigation action is taken. This is aligned with best practice and as recommended by the TCFD and allows companies to understand and stress-test their exposure to high physical risks. CMIP5 selected as it is the most studied and advanced collection of global climate model simulations from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

1. The risk of climate change to cotton production in the US is very high by 2050, while in China rising temperatures and CO2 concentrations could have a positive impact on cotton growing through 2050. Acute weather events can severely limit positive impacts due to rising temperatures and CO2 concentrations. As the significant impact of weather-related events in the wider southeast Asia region are already being experienced, the future magnitude of projected change is expected to be less pronounced. This information further informs our sourcing and investment strategy. As a result of these findings, LS&Co. has made investments in regenerative agriculture, such as the Organic Cotton Accelerator, and participation in the US Cotton Trust Protocol. 2. Heat extremes may increase power usage for cooling at a very high rate in regions such as China, Europe and the US through 2050. The extremes are expected to increase in frequency and intensity. Based on these regions and our own operations additional review and investment of cooling technologies will be evaluated. Heat extremes in key manufacturing regions is also considered very high in Mexico and Pakistan and high in Bangladesh and China and are also expected to increase in frequency and intensity going forward. While risk does vary by country, we will leverage our PACT supplier engagement program to focus on interventions that transition to renewable energy and energy efficient technologies considering potential power curtailment. 3. Opportunities include an increase in demand for circular products, growth, and utilization of energy efficient upgrades. As regulations emerge, we could expect to see a demand for circular business models and growth in recycling technologies. Opportunities to scale circular services, design innovation for recycling and traceability could contribute to revenue advantages. Additionally, in a 1.5C transition we expect to see technological advances of improved efficiency for electrification and declining costs for renewables which could reduce operational costs in our own facility and leased portfolio. Key to enabling this will be supportive policies and a regulatory landscape.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

For FY22, we found that in 2030 and 2040 scenarios, our percentage of direct operations located in water-stressed areas, defined as "High" or "Extremely High" water stress, increased from 45% in 2021 to 59% in 2030 and 60% in 2040. It should be noted that these are near and long-term forecasts with a high degree of uncertainty. As part of our sustainability strategy, utilizing the result of the FY 22 2030 and 2040 scenario analysis, we will now expand our list of direct operations facilities that are exposed to high water-stress. By classifying a facility with an 'at risk' ranking, we will consider amending our 2025 Water Action Plan to include this facility along with associated contextual based water targets. We anticipate making this change over the next fiscal year to our sustainability operational work.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ No, but we are developing a climate transition plan within the next two years

(5.2.15) Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :See explanation

(5.2.16) Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

In 2018, LS&Co. published a climate action strategy for reducing carbon emissions by 2025. The climate action strategy serves as a roadmap for what we plan to do and how we plan to do it through achievable science-based targets across our operations and entire global supply chain, which are incorporated into our long-term financial and strategic business plans. Additionally, to develop our SBTi targets, we conducted scenario analysis and transition planning to ensure our targets were achievable. In addition to the climate action strategy and emissions modeling completed for our SBTi targets, we plan to develop a climate transition plan aligned with a 1.5C world by the end of 2024.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

LS&Co.'s product strategy has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities. Our life cycle assessments (LCAs) and climate scenario modeling demonstrate that we have significant resource requirements and climate-related risks that impact all phases of our product life cycles, with specific concern on material inputs. Using this information, we increased our focus on the relative water intensity of cotton production (strategic decision informed by this climate-related scenario analysis) as well as investments in regenerative agriculture such as the Organic Cotton Accelerator. Additionally, another product strategy influenced by climate-related scenario analysis is our continued promotion and support for The Better Cotton Initiative (BCI), US Cotton Trust Protocol, and Organic Cotton Accelerator which empowers cotton farmers to increase their yields through less water and less chemical use and invest in regenerative farming techniques. In 2023, we sourced approximately 96 percent of our total cotton through BCI. In 2022, we piloted the circular 501 jeans, which is a subset within our broader assortment of 501 jeans. We blended certified organic cotton with Re:NewCell's pioneering Circulose fiber, a sustainably sourced viscose made in part from post-consumer recycled denim and textiles. We also continue to operate our Levi's SecondHand which is both a buy-back and resale platform. Buying a used pair of Levi's jeans saves approximately 80% of the carbon emissions compared to buying a new pair, according to ThredUp. Continuing to invest in sustainable materials as well as circularity are examples of how climate related risks and opportunities are influencing our strategy. Timeframe: Short- and medium term (current through 5-7 years into the future). We anticipate the magnitude of impact on products and services from climate-related risks and opportunities to be medium to high.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

LS&Co.'s supply chain strategy has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities because we import both raw materials and finished garments into all of our operating regions and the success of our business depends on our supplier network. Our ability to import products in a timely and cost-effective manner may be affected by extreme weather conditions such as heat extremes, water shortages, riverine and coastal flooding and cyclones that can affect transportation and warehousing providers, such as port and shipping capacity, labor disputes, political unrest, or additional security requirements globally. Our existing procurement processes take many variables into consideration and continually adjust to mitigate risks, which include climate-related risks. To identify, assess, and evaluate our upstream climate-related risk exposure, we conducted physical and transition climate risk assessments across our supply chain in 2022.This identified that climate change impacts such as heat extremes were high to very high in key sourcing regions. Timeframe: Short- and medium term (current through 5-7 years into the future). The most substantial strategic supply chain-related decision that has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities is our commitment to suppliers reducing the equivalent of 42% of LS&Co.'s Category 1 Scope 3 emissions by 2030 from a 2022 base-year. This builds off of our prior scope 3 SBTi validated commitment of 40% by 2025 over a 2016 base-year. To this end, in 2017, we piloted the International Finance Corporation's Partnership for Cleaner Textile (PaCT) program through which we provide suppliers with technical expertise and access to low-cost financing to support renewable energy and water-saving interventions. Between 2017 – 2021, participating suppliers have been able to reduce water and energy by an annual average of 4% and 7%, respectively, and save 4 million in operating costs. Within the next 1-3 years, we will engage the remainder of our key wet processing suppliers. We will leverage the IFC Global Trade Supplier Finance program which enables suppliers to access competitively priced financing based on criteria such as strong performance on our Terms of Engagement (LS&Co.'s supplier code of conduct) as well as the demonstrated investment of 60% of financing proceeds towards identified PaCT interventions.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

LS&Co.'s strategy for investment in R&D has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities because our collaborative approach to research and sustainable apparel design has produced several environmental breakthroughs for our brands, including reducing water used in the finishing process, increasing the use of cotton farmed to higher environmental, social and economic standards, and increasing the amount of recycled materials in our products and improved chemistry. Timeframe: Short- and medium term (current through 5-7 years into the future). An example of an operations-related decision that has been influenced by *climate-related risks and opportunities was to develop and invest into low-water product lines such as the Levi's WellThread line. The Levi's WellThreadcollection featured fabric and the first-ever commercialized use of "cottonized hemp," which uses far less water and land to grow. In 2022, we piloted the circular 501 jeans. We blended certified organic cotton with Renewcell's pioneering Circulose fiber, a sustainably sourced viscose made in part from post-consumer recycled denim and textiles. We collaborated with Re:NewCell to develop a groundbreaking denim which features organic cotton and Circulose fiber, which is made from worn-out jeans and sustainably sourced viscose. We've taken meaningful steps, launching initiatives that use and scale more sustainable fibers, such as the WellThread jeans with recycled Circulose fiber, increasing cottonized hemp use across our product assortment, and continuing to support development of cultivation methods that use less water, involve fewer pesticides, and promote healthy soil.*

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

LS&Co.'s operations strategy has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities, because we see an opportunity in reducing our operating costs through energy and water efficiency measures as well as in enhancing our reputation and improving the resilience of our operations. Timeframe: Short- and medium term (current through 5-7 years into the future). In 2022, LS&Co. deployed a Global Energy Management System increasing visibility to energy usage and costs throughout our operations. This visibility increases our ability to engage in meaningful dialogue with facility managers and develop tangible site-specific action programs to reduce energy usage. Climate related risks such as cooling in our operations will be considered going forward as a result of the scenario assessment. Examples of investment in our owned-and-operated facilities included our factory in Plock, Poland. where we upgraded 90% of our lighting to LED lights. We estimated energy savings to be 750 MWh/year for the full system, and, in 2018, the factory received an award from the Polish National Energy Conservation Agency for energy efficiency efforts. However, the company decided to close this Poland factory in 2024. In 2020, LS&Co. installed a new solar panel array at our distribution center in Henderson, Nevada that provides about 20% of the facility's electricity needs. The panels were built carport-style to provide shade for employees. The building is also certified Platinum Leadership in Energy and Design (LEED) and was the largest distribution center to receive that accreditation at the time of its initial certification. This upgrade will help the site to maintain its LEED Platinum status, making it the first facility in the apparel industry and second in the country to be recognized with such certification. And in 2021, LS&Co. performed an LED lighting replacement in the mezzanine and retail area of our Canton, MS distribution center at the time. The LED lighting replacement covered approximately 125 thousand square feet with a projected annual energy savings of 730 kWh. However, the company will close the

Canton, MS distribution center in 2024. LS&Co. implemented a sizeable LED lighting replacement project in the UK distribution center that is anticipated to yield annual energy savings of almost 240 MWh.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

LS&Co.'s sustainability strategy is aligned with the Water Resilience Coalition's 2050 commitments. These commitments state that LS&Co. will achieve the following by 2050: 1) Net positive water impact: Achieve a measurable and net positive impact in water-stressed basins on availability, quality and accessibility through industry-leading water operations and basin initiatives; 2) Water-resilient value chain: Develop, implement, and enable strategies to support leading impact-based water resilience practices across the global value chain; and 3) Global leadership: Raise the global ambition of water resilience through public and corporate outreach. These actions are reflected in our sustainability annual plan. Examples of additional actions taken to integrate the water-related issues identified into our long-term (21-30 year timeframe) business objectives. LS&Co. has long been working to ensure that water is available for both communities and commerce. Examples of how water has been integrated into LS&Co.'s long term business objectives, includes programs in the early 1990s where we established the apparel industry's first wastewater quality guidelines. To further extend its benefits, the 2025 Water Action Strategy includes focused strategies to drive resilience beyond manufacturing in areas experiencing high water stress. This is intended to bring greater resilience to our operations and to the communities and watersheds affected by our business.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Our life cycle assessments (LCAs) highlighted the relative water intensity of cotton production and manufacturing. Our Levi's WellThread line collection featured fabric and the first-ever commercialized use of "cottonized hemp," which uses far less water and land to grow. A pair of jeans and a trucker jacket from our Levi's WellThread x Outerknown Spring/Summer collection, for example, were made with a 70/30 cotton-to-cottonized hemp blend. The hemp was sourced from a rain-fed hemp crop and thereby reduced the water used in fiber cultivation by roughly 30%. Below are examples of actions taken to integrate the water-related issues identified into each aspect of the strategic business plan and to achieve our near to midterm (11–15-year timeframe) sustainability product strategy goals: In 2019, we published our 2025 Water Action Strategy, which leverages the best and most current publicly available data sources to address water stress in the supply chain. The strategy is the driving force behind our geographically contextual, facility-level targets to address local water stress. As with other LS&Co.-developed resources, we published our Water Action Strategy as an open-source document to inspire collective action and progress across our industry. We plan to revisit our 2025 Water Action Strategy during FY2024 and will explore potential ambitious 2030 targets to continue deepening our impact in the long-term.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Revenues: As we work to meet the needs and shifting preferences of our global customers, we have an opportunity to develop products that will continue to solidify our position as an apparel industry leader and drive revenues. LS&Co. is reducing the impact of our source materials by investigating and innovating new fiber and fabric strategies to deliver more sustainable products. In 2022, we launched the circular 501 jeans blending certified organic cotton with Re:NewCell's Circulose fiber, a sustainably sourced viscose made in part from post-consumer recycled denim and textiles. We also maintain our SecondHand buyback and resale platform. Market research helps us understand consumer preferences, influencing our product offerings and revenue forecasts. Indirect costs: Incorporating climate-based analysis offers opportunities to reduce operating costs through energy and water efficiency measures. In 2022, LS&Co. implemented a Global Energy Management system to better manage energy data and analyze potential financial investments for site-level interventions. Insights from this system led to LED lighting replacements in 2021 in the Canton, MS and Northampton, UK distribution centers (DC), with the UK DC expected to save nearly 240 MWh annually. While short-term costs will rise due to these capital expenditures, we expect significant long-term reductions in energy-related costs. These assumptions are reflected in our financial plans, with low to medium impact on operating costs. Time horizon: Current (up to 1 year). Capital expenditures: Our financial policies require major capital investments to undergo a rigorous review process, including a formal purchase expenditure request that evaluates financial and nonfinancial metrics, and considers sustainability impacts of these investments. Sustainability is increasingly important in authorizing infrastructure and capital expenditure projects. Where possible, energy and emission calculations are performed on projects scoped for implementation. E.g. in 2021, the Board authorized the investment in LS&Co.'s sixth DC in Europe, inspired by Cradle to Cradle principles. This DC, now operated by a 3rd party, serves as major hub for LS&Co. products in Europe. We seek opportunities for additional energy and water efficiency in capital projects, influencing which projects are approved. The impact on our financial planning for capital expenditures is medium. Time horizon: Current (up to 1 year).

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

LS&Co.'s sustainability operational planning has been influenced by water-related risks and opportunities, because we see an opportunity in reducing our operating costs through water efficiency measures as well as in enhancing our reputation and improving the resilience of our operations. Below are examples of actions taken to achieve our near to midterm (11–15-year timeframe) financial planning goals: • To limit potential financial impacts on our business operations and enhance the resilience of our operations, we use the World Resources Institute Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas to help us gain a basin-level understanding of the local water stress contexts where we operate. We then categorize our suppliers into areas of low, medium and high-water stress. As we work with suppliers on water efficiency targets, the low and medium stress areas receive progressive efficiency targets, while suppliers in areas of high-water stress are assigned aggressive absolute water use reduction targets compared to a 2018 base year. • We plan to revisit our 2025 Water Action Strategy during FY2024 and will explore potential ambitious 2030 targets to continue deepening our impact in the long-term.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

0

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

0

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

-67

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

318

(5.9.5) Please explain

Water-related CAPEX remained the same between FY22 and FY23 and is anticipated to remain unchanged between FY23 and FY24. CAPEX remained the same between FY22 and FY23 because LS&Co. invests in water-related CAPEX as needed, and no additional fixed assets were needed to be acquired or upgraded. CAPEX funds have been used in the past to fund more water-efficient manufacturing equipment in O&O factories. Water-related OPEX decreased 67% between FY22 and FY23 but is anticipated to increase significantly between FY23 and FY24 as we prepare to expand our WASH initiatives and prepare to develop a new 2030 water strategy.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

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

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(5.10.4) Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities

For carbon price: Due to uncertainties in allocation methodologies and internal complexities, we are awaiting further guidance about how to implement this. For water price: LS&Co. recognizes that water is drastically undervalued. The price of water does not accurately reflect the actual total cost of services, including, but not limited to, costs related to extraction, transport, supply and sanitation services, treatment, energy use, discharge, regulatory permits and compliance, and maintenance. Furthermore, complexities of pricing water increase when accounting for the environmental and socio-cultural values of water.
[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

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

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

Select from:
☑ No standardized procedure

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

LS&Co. continues to make progress engaging investors and shareholders.

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Water

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

After measuring supplier impacts, we are starting to set thresholds for dependencies. Following a climate scenario assessment, we identified high-risk regions for climate related impacts in a 4.0C scenario. We evaluate key tier 1 vendors in these regions, using Higg FEM data to assess supplier emissions' contribution to scope 3. These results inform supplier-specific roadmaps, track progress against targets and compare emissions performance, identifying the highest emitters.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

31

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Tier 1&2 key suppliers use the WRI tool to categorize facilities into low, medium, & high-water stress areas. High-water stress means a high or extremely high rating from WRI. Low/medium stress areas get efficiency targets; high-stress areas get absolute water use targets for 2025 commitments. The EIM tool is used to rank SKUs producing denim below 32 liters per garment as green. A 'substantive' impact affects 1% of annual revenue. Key suppliers (80% of product) must comply with ZDHC standards.

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

16
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

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

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

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Encourage operational change in the areas of greatest impact: Set climate targets for key suppliers that align with the SBTi. Leverage platforms and contracts to monitor direct and indirect supplier sustainability performance.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

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

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

For Tier 1 & Tier 2 key supplier facilities, suppliers are categorized into areas of low, medium, & high-water stress based on the raw Aqueduct Overall Water Risk – Textile indicator from the WRI tool. LS&Co defines 'high water stress' as either the 'high' or 'extremely high' rating from the WRI tool. Key supplier facilities in low and medium stress areas receive progressive efficiency targets, and facilities in areas of high-water stress are assigned more stringent absolute water use targets.

[Fixed row]

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

	Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process	Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance	Comment
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	*Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	*Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Off-site third-party audit

☑ On-site third-party audit

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

As of 2022, all supplier contracts require adherence to our updated supplier code of conduct, covering environmental compliance, waste, water, wastewater, air and greenhouse gas management. Suppliers must have energy management policies and programs to reduce energy intensity and emissions, and to measure, manage, and disclose GHG emissions and carbon footprint to LS&Co. We collect climate-related data from suppliers through the Higg Facility Environmental Management (FEM) tool and collaborate with suppliers whose environmental goals align with our own. The Higg FEM standardizes annual environmental performance assessments Key suppliers must report energy usage and efficiency in the Sustainable Apparel Coalition's Higg Index. LS&Co. uses this data to set targets for supplier energy efficiency and renewable energy investments. We aim for 100% key supplier facilities to report data, with80% achieving this in 2023, including 88% of our 'key mills' We will expand our use of the Higg Index to meet our science-based target of reducing 42% of our Category 1 Scope 3 emissions by 2030 from a 2022 baseline. In 2023, we engaged suppliers on their 2025 GHG targets using Higg Index data with our new scope 3 commitment validated by SBTi we will update supplier targets. The business case for circularity is clear: in 2023, raw materials used in LS&Co. products accounted for 27% of our carbon footprint. Sourcing sustainable materials and implementing a circular approach reduces our footprint

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Off-site third-party audit

☑ On-site third-party audit

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Through the Higg Facility Environmental Module (Higg FEM) platform, the annual validation of environmentally relevant data by factories has been driven since 2016 to monitor and steer ongoing water reduction projects in factories based on Higg's validated data. Facilities in low and medium stress areas receive progressive efficiency targets, and facilities in areas of high-water stress are assigned more stringent absolute water use targets. These water use targets roll up into our 2025 commitment to reducing our water use in manufacturing by 50 percent against a 2018 baseline in areas of high-water stress Our partners in the Supplier Sourcing Management function communicate their expectations that these suppliers meet our water-related requirements.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

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

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

31

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

To make progress and achieve our goal of reducing supply chain emissions (Scope 3, Category 1) by 42% by 2030, we must collaborate with our suppliers. We are working with our key suppliers, those representing approximately 80% of final product units, to make sure their emission reduction targets are at least 42%. To date, key suppliers have agreed to targets between 40% and 60%. Achieving these goals will require not only facility changes to equipment, but also investment in renewable energy of multiple forms. Every year we evaluate if the suppliers are in compliance and adjust targets and engagement strategy accordingly.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Signed contracts with LS&Co. require suppliers to have energy management policies and programs to reduce energy intensity and emissions production. Higg FEM data will help set targets for supplier energy efficiency and investments in renewable energy

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

Select from:

☑ No

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

20

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

For Tier 1 & Tier 2 key supplier facilities, suppliers are categorized into areas of low, medium, & high-water stress based on the raw Aqueduct Overall Water Risk – Textile indicator from the WRI tool. LS&Co defines 'high water stress' as either the 'high' or 'extremely high' rating from the WRI tool. 'Key supplier facilities' manufacture approximately 80% of LS&Co.'s global products annually. Key supplier facilities in low and medium stress areas receive progressive efficiency targets, and facilities in areas of high-water stress are assigned a more stringent 50% absolute water reduction target by 2025 (vs. 2018 base year). Our quantitative threshold for success is the % of suppliers that achieve this 50% target at end of 2025. We are confident that our engagement is impactful because our KPI is 'water withdrawal reduction in high water stressed areas'.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Water use targets roll up into our 2025 commitment to: 1) reducing our water use in manufacturing by 50 percent against a 2018 baseline in areas of high-water stress

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

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Life Cycle Assessment studies inform our strategy for prioritizing engagements and serve as a measurement for impact. LS&Co.'s rationale for prioritizing engagements with customers is based on our LCA studies. In 2013, we commissioned our second lifecycle assessment for three of our core products, a Levi's 501, a pair of Women's jeans, and a Dockers Signature Khaki. For a pair of Levi's 501 specifically, we learned that the greatest impact on climate change resulted from consumer use (37%). Based on these results, we decided to target 100% of our customer base through our "Care Tag for Our Planet" program, changing the product care tags in our clothing to include instructions about ways consumers can reduce the environmental impact of their clothes after leaving the store. Additionally, in 2021, we launched the Buy Better, Wear Longer advertising campaign with the objective of engaging customers to create awareness about the impact of the waste generated from the apparel industry on the environment. The Buy Better, Wear Longer campaign materials continued to be available on social media channels in 2023.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The Buy Better, Wear Longer campaign, launched in 2021, aims to raise awareness about overproduction and overconsumption, urging everyone to be more intentional about how we design, make, sell and buy clothes. This campaign encourages global consumers to rethink fashion production and consumption. The campaign's reach has grown significantly, with initial videos garnering over 500K views and the 2022 campaign surpassing 5M as of June 2024. Positive social sentiment indicates strong consumer alignment with the campaign's message. Success is measured by the annual Global Brand Equities survey, which assesses consumer perception of Levi's commitment to protecting natural resources. The goal is a 5% YOY increase in our score on the question: "[Levi's] Makes jeans that responsibly protect Earth's natural resources". Our score in Q1 '23 was 49%, which was slightly down from 51% in Q1 '22. Impact: Linked to our performance on the annual Global Brand Equities survey, The "Buy Better, Wear Longer" campaign highlights the need rethink fashion and its impacts on climate change, addressing the doubling of global clothing consumption between 2000 and 2020. The campaign emphasizes shared responsibility for the environmental impacts of apparel production and consumption, and showcases our ongoing efforts to promote sustainable production practices, reduce our own natural resource footprint, and deliver a more planet-friendly apparel industry.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**NGO Partnerships

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Water is necessary for people, communities and the planet — and to create many of the beloved products our consumers enjoy. LS&Co. has long been working to ensure that water is available for both communities and commerce

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

LS&Co. has been at the forefront of water stewardship in the apparel industry. In addition to engaging our key vendor suppliers, we also participate in global initiatives and NGO partnerships. For global initiatives, we are a CEO Water Mandate signatory and member of the Water Resilience Coalition. These initiatives help guide our water stewardship actions throughout our value chain and ensure that we collaborate with our peers on collective action opportunities in key basins. Success for participation in these global initiatives is measured by achieving the three goals outlined by the Water Resilience Coalition by 2050. We also partner with the ZDHC Foundation and Waves for Water Foundation. Our partnership with the ZDHC Foundation has helped us develop initiatives aimed at reducing the use of hazardous chemicals, water recycling, and wastewater treatment throughout our value chain. Success for this initiative is measured by meeting our zero discharge of hazardous chemicals goal. Our partnership with Waves for Water Foundation helps us provide clean water access to communities in need adjacent to our key vendor suppliers. Success for this partnership is measured by completion of the three-year agreement.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations
☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

In engagement with FICCA, we continue to work with this partner through advocacy to government bodies in key sourcing countries to advance the decarbonization transition of electricity grids, as well as increase the number of and access to financial incentives for suppliers through government programs for the procurement of renewable energy and associated capital equipment transitions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

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

☑ Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

We continuously strive to improve our accounting methodologies.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

We have and continue to develop alternative programs and initiatives with our supply chain to support their reduction of climate emissions. The initiatives are not due to CDP
[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Include companies, entities, or groups over which operational control is exercised*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Include companies, entities, or groups over which operational control is exercised*
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :N/A	*N/A*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :N/A	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

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

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

	Scope 2, location-based	**Scope 2, market-based**	**Comment**
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2016

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7243.12

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Life cycle inventory developed from activity data and life cycle assessment models.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2016

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

47831.85

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Life cycle inventory developed from activity data and life cycle assessment models.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2016

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42704.24

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Life cycle inventory developed from activity data and life cycle assessment models.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2144571

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions were calculated using a custom hybrid life cycle assessment model and database for 100% of procured direct (fashion related materials and products) and indirect (non-fashion) goods and services over the reporting period. Purchased goods and services refers to all procured direct materials, material processing and manufacturing of fashion products as well as spend on all non-capital products and services not directly linked to sold products (indirect spend). Emissions estimates for this Scope 3 category were calculated using procurement and inventory data in a hybrid LCA model, using a spend based analysis for indirect spend and a bottom up, mass based unit process LCA approach, modeled at the item level, for the entire fashion inventory. While LS&Co. has made significant improvements to our emission calculation methodology, this is a continuous improvement process and we will continue refining the methodology as more information becomes available. All values represent cradle-to-vendor-gate emissions across all GHG emissions identified in the GHG Protocol Value Chain Standard, using GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7202

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions were calculated using an economic input-output life cycle assessment approach for 100% of capital expenditures data over the reporting period. All values represent cradle-to-gate emissions across all GHG emissions identified in the GHG Protocol Value Chain Standard and GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8357

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions were calculated using data from the company’s energy consumption across owned and operated facilities. Location- and Market- based emissions factors at the regional level were derived using regional fuel mix and T&D losses reported by multiple sources, including the latest datasets from US EPA’s eGRID, the International Energy (IEA) Agency, the Canadian and Australian governments and the Association of Issuing Bodies. Values were calculated using GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and represent upstream emissions from the production and transportation of fuels consumed by the company in the reporting year as well as T&D losses associated with electricity use.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

89569

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Primary cargo mass, transport mode, and distance were provided by the company’s logistics vendors for both inbound and outbound transportation. The client provided inbound data. Inbound and outbound emissions were then quantified by multiplying the provided t-km by emission factors (kg CO2e per t-km transport) provided by the logistics vendors. Area and location data for 3PL warehouses were used to estimate annual energy consumption, based on primary data provided by client’s logistics team, of similar facilities in each region. Location data were also used to assign emission factors associated with the local electricity grid for each location to estimate emissions accordingly.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15083

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions were calculated using an economic input-output life cycle assessment approach for 100% of waste expenditures data over the reporting period. All values represent cradle-to-gate emissions across all GHG emissions identified in the GHG Protocol Value Chain Standard and GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9523

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Values represent all emissions associated with purchased air travel, public transit and rental cars, as well as estimated emissions from business travel accommodations. All emission values for air travel were provided by travel vendors. Emissions from rental cars, public transit and travel accommodations were estimated using an economic input-out life cycle assessment approach. All values were calculated using GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18212

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For standard commuting, emissions were estimated using the total number of employees, an assumed breakdown of commuting patterns (mode and distance) based on American Community Survey Reports published by the U.S. Census Bureau and average emissions factors for U.S. automobiles and mass transit from WRI's GHG Protocol Calculation Tools. Teleworking was quantified using average household energy data from IEA, average household size from US Census data and assumptions about average work area in the home and hours of work to estimate electricity consumption. This figure was then multiplied by the IEA global average emission factor to quantify total emissions from telecommuting.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Upstream leased assets are not applicable in the Company's business.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

303454

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Building electricity consumption per square foot of floor space for downstream retail and distribution centers was modelled using average values from owned and operating DCs and retailers. The total square footage required to house stacked products in the retail and DC buildings was estimated based on the dimensions of a representative product (pair of jeans). This value was then used to determine the overall electricity consumption for the items sold. Downstream transportation impacts were determined using estimated garment weights for items sold and an assumed distance travelled.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant because there is no downstream processing of sold fashion.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1201054

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions resulting from the use of sold products were calculated for washing and drying activities associated with the use of apparel products over the average lifetime of the product. Use of sold products in apparel refer to the energy use associated with washing, drying, and other relevant activities performed on apparel products between uses. Product lifetimes were determined in accordance with peer-reviewed literature values based on average total number of wears for a product category, e.g., t-shirts, pants, etc. and the number of wears per wash. Wears per wash were derived from survey data specific to country or region in which the product was sold. Sales region also dictated the wash water temperature and drying methods.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

82186

(7.5.3) Methodological details

End of life treatment emissions were calculated according to the total mass of sold product in a particular region. A mix of waste management facility types, e.g., landfill, incineration, etc. were used for each country or region in which the products were sold. Primary data were not available for reuse/recycling. Primary data is not available for this category. As such, best available assumptions were used to estimate the fate of sold products and associated emissions. Thus assumed 11% of sold products were either recycled or put another use.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The space that LS&Co. subleases to external organizations is below significance threshold of 1% based on the extremely small footprint of these spaces.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29837

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The reported figure represents franchise Scope 1 & 2 emissions. Primary energy data is not available for franchise facilities, so energy was estimated by using average energy per area from owned and operated facilities and then multiplied by the area of each franchise facility, as reported to the company. Emissions were then calculated by multiplying the resulting facility energy estimate by country-level emission factors from IEA.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

11/27/2022

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The Company does not have significant investments as part of its core business.
[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	*10077*	*Life cycle inventory developed from activity data and life cycle assessment models.*

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)	Methodological details
Reporting year	*42358*	*1608*	*Life cycle inventory developed from activity data and life cycle assessment models.*

[Fixed row]

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

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1993386

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Hybrid method
☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions were calculated using a custom hybrid life cycle assessment model and database for 100% of procured direct (fashion related materials and products) and indirect (non-fashion) goods and services over the reporting period. All values represent cradle-to-vendor-gate emissions across all GHG emissions identified in the GHG Protocol Value Chain Standard, using GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Purchased goods and services refers to all procured direct materials, material processing and manufacturing of fashion products as well as spend on all non-capital products and services not directly linked to sold products (indirect spend). Emissions estimates for this Scope 3 category were calculated using procurement and inventory data in a hybrid LCA model, using a spend based analysis for indirect spend and a bottom up, mass based unit process LCA approach, modeled at the item level, for the entire fashion inventory.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

9822

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions were calculated using an economic input-output life cycle assessment approach for 100% of capital expenditures data over the reporting period. All values represent cradle-to-gate emissions across all GHG emissions identified in the GHG Protocol Value Chain Standard and GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

7410

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions were calculated using data from the company's energy consumption across owned and operated facilities. Location- and Market- based emissions factors at the regional level were derived using regional fuel mix and T&D losses reported by multiple sources, including the latest datasets from US EPA's eGRID, the International Energy (IEA) Agency, the Canadian and Australian governments and the Association of Issuing Bodies. Values were calculated using GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and represent upstream emissions from the production and transportation of fuels consumed by the company in the reporting year as well as T&D losses associated with electricity use.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

54377

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

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

89

(7.8.5) Please explain

Primary cargo mass, transport mode, and distance were provided by the company's logistics vendors for both inbound and outbound transportation. The client provided inbound data. Inbound and outbound emissions were then quantified by multiplying the provided t-km by emission factors (kg CO2e per t-km transport) provided by the logistics vendors. Area and location data for 3PL warehouses were used to estimate annual energy consumption based on primary data (provided by LSCO team to fill in) of similar facilities in each region. Location data were also used to assign emission factors associated with the local electricity grid for each location to estimate emissions accordingly.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

14199

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions were calculated using an economic input-output life cycle assessment approach for 100% of waste expenditures data over the reporting period. All values represent cradle-to-gate emissions across all GHG emissions identified in the GHG Protocol Value Chain Standard and GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

8546

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Values represent all emissions associated with purchased air and rail travel, public transit and rental cars, as well as estimated emissions from business travel accommodations. All emission values for air, rental car, and rail travel were provided by travel vendors. Emissions from public transit and travel accommodations were estimated using an economic input-out life cycle assessment approach. All values were calculated using GWP values from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

26567

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

For standard commuting, emissions were estimated using the total number of employees, an assumed breakdown of commuting patterns (mode and distance) based on American Community Survey Reports published by the U.S. Census Bureau and average emissions factors for U.S. automobiles and mass transit from WRI's GHG Protocol Calculation Tools. Teleworking was quantified using average household energy data from IEA, average household size from US Census data and assumptions about average work area in the home and hours of work to estimate electricity consumption. This figure was then multiplied by the IEA global average emission factor to quantify total emissions from telecommuting.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Upstream leased assets are not applicable in the Company's business.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

298782

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Building electricity consumption per square foot of floor space for downstream retail and distribution centers was modeled using average values from owned and operating DCs and retailers. The total square footage required to house stacked products in the retail and DC buildings was estimated based on the dimensions of a representative product (pair of jeans). This value was then used to determine the overall electricity consumption for the items sold. Downstream transportation impacts were determined using estimated garment weights for items sold and an assumed distance traveled. Primary data is not available for this category. As such, best available assumptions were used to estimate the overall magnitude of emissions from downstream transportation and distribution.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant because there is no downstream processing of sold fashion.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1201891

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Methodology for indirect use phase emissions

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions resulting from the use of sold products were calculated for washing and drying activities associated with the use of apparel products over the average lifetime of the product. Product lifetimes were determined in accordance with peer-reviewed literature values based on average total number of wears for a product category, e.g., t-shirts, pants, etc. and the number of wears per wash. Wears per wash were derived from survey data specific to country or region in which the product was sold. Sales region also dictated the wash water temperature and drying method. Use of sold products in apparel refer to the energy use associated with washing, drying, and other relevant activities performed on apparel products between uses.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

81192

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

End of life treatment emissions were calculated according to the total mass of sold product in a particular region. A mix of waste management facility types, e.g., landfill, incineration, etc. were used for each country or region in which the products were sold. Primary data were not available for reuse/recycling, so an assumed 11% of sold products were either recycled or put another use. Primary data is not available for this category. As such, best available assumptions were used to estimate the fate of sold products and associated emissions.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant because the company does not act as a lessor.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

36050

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The reported figure represents franchise Scope 1 & 2 emissions. Primary energy data is not available for franchise facilities, so energy was estimated by using average energy per area from owned and operated facilities and then multiplied by the area of each franchise facility, as reported to the company. Emissions were then calculated by multiplying the resulting facility energy estimate by country-level emission factors from IEA.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The Company does not have significant investments as part of its core business.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Levis_2023_VerificationStatement_V1-1_050224.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

2

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Levis_2023_VerificationStatement_V1-1_050224.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Levis_2023_VerificationStatement_V1-1_050224.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

Levis_2023_VerificationStatement_V1-1_050224.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1755

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

This is related to renewable electricity certificates only. The numerator is the increase in RECs in 2023 minus the RECs in 2022 (37219 – 35464). The denominator is the previous year (2022) REC emissions (35464). This shows the YoY emissions decrease and decrease % attributable to the increase in RECs.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Unable to define impact

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Relevant
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO_2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO_2e)

8200

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH_4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO_2e)

2

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

9

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

1866

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 5

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ PFCs

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 6

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ SF6

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 7

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ NF3

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

Algeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22.49

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

480.903

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.23

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

24.994

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Bangladesh

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.82

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

19.038

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

19.04

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65.97

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

116.024

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5.3

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

67.3

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

67.3

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29.6

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

136.663

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Bulgaria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Cambodia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

274.86

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

239.573

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38.54

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

540.466

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

106.32

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2670.326

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

China, Macao Special Administrative Region

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10.03

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

177.756

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5.35

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

17.717

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Dominican Republic

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Egypt

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.45

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

26.122

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

26.12

El Salvador

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.86

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3.081

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36.31

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

74.485

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

335.8

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1092.824

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1.15

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.95

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

37.922

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Guatemala

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.96

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

52.556

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36.26

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

791.108

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.02

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

16.35

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

16.35

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.67

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

41.84

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36.4

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

436.71

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

118.71

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1126.922

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Kenya

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Lesotho

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Madagascar

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28.21

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

969.355

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Mauritius

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

83.83

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1255.987

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

132.92

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

176.031

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.31

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

30.028

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

37.8

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.52

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0.509

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Pakistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26.68

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

390.201

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13.66

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

100.236

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

100.24

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.5

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

6.118

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

6.12

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2194.29

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2753.627

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

184.69

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26.86

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

320.506

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

320.51

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.99

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

80.963

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

82.01

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11.64

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

164.744

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

164.74

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

812.5

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2285.456

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35.54

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

206.669

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Sri Lanka

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.45

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1.094

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.25

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0.607

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17.51

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

511.853

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

511.85

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24.7

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

434.745

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14.38

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

314.622

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

19.6

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.23

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

15.555

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

15.56

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

535.51

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

969.717

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

28.8

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3409.44

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

23352.548

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

Row 1

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Plant

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

2925

Row 3

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Distribution Centers

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

2633

Row 4

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Retail

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

2099

Row 5

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Vehicle Fleet

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

1535

Row 6

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Office

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

666

Row 7

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Warehouse

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

198

Row 8

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Beyond Yoga

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

20
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

Row 1

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Distribution Centers

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

16026

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 2

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Offices

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2342

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

273

Row 3

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Retail Stores

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

20178

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1208

Row 4

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Plants

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3664

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

117

Row 5

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Fleet

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

6

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

6

Row 6

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Warehouse

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

297

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4

Row 7

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Beyond Yoga

(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

25

(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0
[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10077

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42538

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1608

(7.22.4) Please explain

Company

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

Other entities not included
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We have hundreds of customers across geographies receiving a wide range of products over the course of the year and additional insight would be needed on total volumes and PC9's by account and geography would be required. We do not have visibility how wholesale accounts split product orders across geographies. Additionally, as this would related to volume and SKU specific information this could disclose confidential information related to customer sales.

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Managing the different emission factors of diverse and numerous geographies makes calculating total footprint difficult

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We have hundreds of customers across geographies receiving a wide range of products over the course of the year and additional insight would be needed on total volumes and PC9's by account and geography would be required. We do not have visibility how wholesale accounts split product orders across geographies. Additionally, as this would related to volume and SKU specific information this could disclose confidential information related to customer sales.

Row 3

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Doing so would require we disclose business sensitive/proprietary information

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We have hundreds of customers across geographies receiving a wide range of products over the course of the year and additional insight would be needed on total volumes and PC9's by account and geography would be required. We do not have visibility how wholesale accounts split product orders across geographies. Additionally, as this would related to volume and SKU specific information this could disclose confidential information related to customer sales.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☑ Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

(7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Limited resources are available to support customer emissions allocation and there is no standard that would ensure all suppliers would allocate emissions in the same manner. With regulation quickly approaching, resources are focused on ensuring disclosure with EU, and US national and state law.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

40250

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

40250

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

106436

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

95637

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

202073

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1108

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1108

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1948

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1948

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

108384

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

136995

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

245379
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

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

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

3076

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Fuel Oil

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

32439

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Natural Gas

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4734

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Vehicle fleet gasoline, diesel, hybrid fuel, plug in electric hybrid vehicle, standby diesel fuel

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

40249

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information
[Fixed row]

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

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1948

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1948

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

1948

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1948

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Australia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

752

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Australian LGC

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

Select from:
☑ Australia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Austria

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

127

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Austria

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

768

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

13

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Belgium

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1018

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :RI-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Brazil

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

2911

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

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

Select from:
☑ Canada

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Chile

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1445

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

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

Select from:
☑ Chile

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify : Solar, wind, hydropower

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

4360

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Czechia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

406

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Czechia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Denmark

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

171

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Denmark

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Finland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Finland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ France

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

768

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ France

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ France

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

392

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ France

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

2172

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1105

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Germany

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Greece

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

109

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Greece

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 17

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Hungary

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

270

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Hungary

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 18

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ India

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1104

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

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

Select from:
☑ India

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 19

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

135

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Ireland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 20

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1700

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Italy

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 21

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

2424

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ J-Credit (Renewable)

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

Select from:
☑ Japan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 22

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1563

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

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

Select from:
☑ Malaysia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 23

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Mexico

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

3082

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

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

Select from:
☑ Mexico

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 24

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

594

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 25

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Norway

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

49

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Norway

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 26

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1055

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Pakistan

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 27

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Poland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

4180

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Poland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 28

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

2539

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ South Africa

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 29

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

1413

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ Spain

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 30

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

80

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Sweden

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 31

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

6

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

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

Select from:

☑ Switzerland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 32

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

923

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 33

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify : Solar, wind, hydropower

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

633

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Turkey

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 34

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

4410

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 35

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

388

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ GO

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

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 37

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Wind

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

2127

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 38

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:** Solar, wind, hydropower

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

51510

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

Row 39

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

9701

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Virtual Power Purchase Agreement
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Algeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

752

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

4

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

756.00

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

127

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

9

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

136.00

Bangladesh

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

33.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

781

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

146

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

927.00

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

223

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

223.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1018

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1018.00

Bulgaria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Cambodia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2911

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1231

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4142.00

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1445

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1445.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4360

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4360.00

China, Macao Special Administrative Region

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

406

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

406.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

171

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

171.00

Dominican Republic

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Eygpt

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

65

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

65.00

El Salvador

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

32

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

32.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1159

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1159.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3280

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

14

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1276

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4570.00

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

109

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

109.00

Guatemala

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

270

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

270.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1104

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1104.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

21

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

21.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

135

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

135.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1700

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

24

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1724.00

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2424

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

368

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

2792.00

Kenya

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Lesotho

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Madagascar

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1563

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1563.00

Mauritius

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3082

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3082.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

594

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

653

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1247.00

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

157

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

157.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

49

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

49.00

Pakistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1055

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1055.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

538

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

538.00

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

9.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4259

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1090

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

11809

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

17158.00

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

701

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

73

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

774.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

297

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

297.00

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

430

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

430.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2539

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

3076

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

5615.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1413

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1413.00

Sri Lanka

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

80

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

80.00

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6.00

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

897

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

897.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

923

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

923.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

675

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

2

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

677.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

33.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4895

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

4

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

2459

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

7358.00

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

63337

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1948

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

14384

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

79669.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.00001885

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

11685

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

6200000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

21

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our Scope 1 and 2 emissions went down while the company's revenue slightly increased.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2017

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF_3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

11/30/2016

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

7243.12

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

42704.25

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

0.000

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

49947.370

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

11/30/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

90

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

4994.737

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

10077

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

1608

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

11685.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:
☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

85.12

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

100%

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Absolute reduction in scope 1 and 2 carbon emissions.

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

Drive energy efficiency practices, investments, operations, renewable energy investments, and leverage market instruments

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:
☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

131 _Near-Term Target Validation Report - Levi Strauss _ Co.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

11/15/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)
☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

11/27/2022

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1944947

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

1944947.000

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

1944947.000

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

98

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

52

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

50

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

11/24/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1128069.260

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1784603

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

1784603.000

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

1784603.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions/removals associated with bioenergy and non-land related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT with bioenergy)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

19.63

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers scope 3 category 1 but only apparel production, indirect spend is excluded.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Levi Strauss & Co commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services by 42% by FY 2030 from a FY2022 base year.

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

We will be dedicating our focus in 4 key areas – expanding high impact programs to a greater number of suppliers, transitioning to more sustainable materials, investing in efficiency and accelerating renewable energy with our suppliers and improving primary data acquisition. We aim to work on many of the interventions associated with these four themes in collaboration with industry peers and 3rd party organizations.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

11/15/2023

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

☑ Abs2

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Net- Zero Approval Letter - Levi Strauss _ Co.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers category 1 – purchased goods and services (apparel production) and is inclusive of FLAG emissions. As well as category 4 (upstream logistics), category 5 (waste), category 6 (business travel), category 9 (downstream logistics), category 12 (end of life treatment) as well as scope 1 & 2 Exclusions include catetgory 2 (capital goods), category 3 (fuel), category 7 (employee commuting), category 11 (use – but not required for apparel sector) LS&Co. does not calculate category 8, 10,13,14,15 as they are not relevant.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Levi Strauss & Co. Commits to maintain 90% absolute scope 1 & 2 GHG emission reductions from 2025 through 2050 against a 2016 base year. Levi Strauss & Co. Commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions by 90% by 2050 from a 2022 base year.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ No, we do not plan to mitigate emissions beyond our value chain

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ No, we do not plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

LS&Co. Will implement our long-term emission reduction targets via deep supply chain engagement and renewable energy uptake. Implementation activities will include setting supplier targets that are 1.5C aligned, advocating for renewable energy, supporting circular materials, accelerating decarbonization capacity building, shifts in sourcing strategies and reducing emissions associated with logistics.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Target progress will be reviewed annually upon completion of our GHG inventory. Specific dashboards have been developed for in scope categories to track progress.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*0*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*1*	*36*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

36

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

0

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

10900

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information. Changing utility company rates resulted in no cost savings.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We will follow compliance requirements in given markets where we operate.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our cluster level retail sustainability core working group forums aims to engage employees to advance operational, behavioral, process, and infra energy and emission reduction activities.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water withdrawal intensity of similar facilities of the same type.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories. We quantify 100% of our owned & operated sites here because they are within our control.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We do not have complete visibility into the source of water withdrawals from our owned & operated sites due to lack of data availability. The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

We do not receive this data in our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail stores, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water discharge intensity of similar facilities of the same type.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our direct operations refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories. We quantify 100% of owned & operated sites here because they are within our control. It is worth noting that effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water discharge intensity of similar facilities of the same type.

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co. and so it would not be recommended to monitor these water quality parameters.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water discharge intensity of similar facilities of the same type.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories. We quantify 100% of sites here because they are within our control.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

One of our owned factories, based in South Africa, uses 100% recycled water in its manufacturing processes sourced from a local POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories. Aside from our owned factory in South Africa, we do not receive this data in our direct operations.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Direct monitoring

(9.2.4) Please explain

LS&Co.'s Sustainability Guidebook requires that all direct operations sites are in accordance with local regulations regarding access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene facilities.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

493

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water withdrawal intensity of similar facilities of the same type. Our uncertainty range is between 10 – 20% because of data gaps. The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

434

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water discharge intensity of similar facilities of the same type. Our uncertainty range is between 10 – 20% because of data gaps. The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

This is quantified as the difference between 'total withdrawals' and 'total discharges'. Our uncertainty range is between 10 – 20% because of data gaps. The scope here is our direct operations, which refers to our owned & operated sites that includes retail, offices, distribution centers, and 2 factories

[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

12

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

2.43

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

This is quantified through a combination of primary data from utility invoices and estimations based on square footage and the water withdrawal intensity of similar facilities of the same type. We report withdrawal for 100% of our direct operations facilities based on the location of the sites as we do not have data on the original withdrawal source location for all sites. We use the WRI Aqueduct tool to generate approximate lat/long coordinates for all these O&O sites. Risks for owned & operated facilities are identified through a combination of indicators from the WRI Aqueduct tool. For owned & operated facilities, facilities are determined to be 'at risk' if they meet the following criteria: located in an area of high or extremely high Aqueduct Overall Water Risk - Textile
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant to operations

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant to operations

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant to operations

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant to operations

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

434

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

100% of effluent from our owned & operated sites are treated at municipal publicly-owned treatment works (POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions) in accordance with local regulations and therefore is not directly discharged to local waterways by LS&Co.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant to operations
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

55

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

Although there is a potential risk to each of these individual facilities, we intentionally have redundancy in our direct operations to mitigate any disruptions.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

34

(9.3.4) Please explain

Although there is a potential risk to each of these individual facilities, we intentionally have redundancy in our supply chain to mitigate any disruptions. This estimate covers the key supplier facilities in our supply chain
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20013987-South city Kolkata

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

22.574354

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

88.362873

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20014662-LEVI Outlet Store Lahore (Karim Block)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20014860-LEVI Flagship Store Lahore

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20014992-Levis Store Z Block

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20015000-Dockers Store Z Block

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20018908-Express Mall Chennai Ground Floor

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify : East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

13.084301

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

80.270462

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20018918-Express Mall Chennai First Floor

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify : East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

13.084301

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

80.270462

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20025285-Acropolis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

22.574354

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

88.362873

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20025717-LuluKochin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify : South Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

9.931233

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.267304

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20025958-FO Saddar

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20025970-Zhengzhou Shanshan Outlet

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

34.74725

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

113.62493

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20026787-Dockers Packages Mall

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20026788-Levis Packages Mall

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called ‘waste water treatment plant’ or ‘effluent treatment plant’ in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and ‘textile industry’ weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20026863-Levis & Dockers Lucky Mall

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify : Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20026962-Big Centre

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify **:** West Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

19.218331

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

72.97809

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20027407-FO Nipa

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20027533-Airport Terminal 3 (O&O store at New Delhi)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.61393

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.208828

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20029410-Select Citywalk

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.61393

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.208828

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20029559-In orbit Hitech Mall

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

17.406498

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

78.477244

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called ‘waste water treatment plant’ or ‘effluent treatment plant’ in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and ‘textile industry’ weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031043-Zhengzhou WFJ SciTech Outlet

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.30323

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

113.92675

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 21

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 21

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031680-Atrium Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called ‘waste water treatment plant’ or ‘effluent treatment plant’ in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and ‘textile industry’ weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 22

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 22

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031681-Bahria Town Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 23

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 23

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031682-Faisalabad Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.450366

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.134961

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 24

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 24

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031683-Fortress Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 25

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 25

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031684-Gulgasht Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

30.186356

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

71.488581

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 26

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 26

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031685-Gulshan Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 27

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 27

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031686-PECO Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 28

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 28

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031687-Sialkot Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.494499

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.522892

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 29

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 29

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20031757-North Walk Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 30

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 30

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032063-FO Gujranwala 20025818

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.187692

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.194453

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 31

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 31

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032205-Gujrat Levis Bhimber Road

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.573073

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.100504

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 32

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 32

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032207-FO Mosimyat

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify : Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 33

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 33

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032209-Levi Outlet Store Karachi A 20014663A

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 34

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 34

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032209-Levi Outlet Store Karachi B 20014663B

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 35

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 35

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032209-Levi Outlet Store Karachi C 20014663C

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify **:** Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 36

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 36

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20032940-Hyderabad Levis, Fortune Arcade

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.395969

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

68.357776

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 37

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 37

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

200-Indira Nagar (O&O store at Bangalore)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify : East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.971599

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.594563

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.16

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.14

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.14

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.03

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 38

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 38

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

951-Natal, RN Midway Shopping Center

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Other, please specify :East Brazil

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-5.40258

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-36.954107

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.06

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.05

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 39

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 39

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

CE Serviced Offices Pvt Ltd

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.971599

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.594563

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.52

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.43

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.43

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.08

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 40

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 40

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ITC Green Centre GCC

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.971599

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.594563

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.41

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.35

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.35

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 41

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 41

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ITC Levis Experience Centre

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.971599

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.594563

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.06

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.06

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 42

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 42

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

ITC New Office Bangalore

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.971599

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.594563

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.47

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.07

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

2.07

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.39

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 43

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 43

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Lulu Mall G23

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :South Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

9.931233

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.267304

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.06

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.05

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 44

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 44

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Mall of India

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.535516

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.391026

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.34

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.29

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.29

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 45

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 45

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Office-2306-Jakarta

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :Java-Timor

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-6.194449

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

106.82292

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.49

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.41

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.41

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.08

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 46

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 46

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Office-2479-Bangladesh Rep Office

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Bangladesh

☑ Ganges - Brahmaputra

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.804093

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

90.415238

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.46

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.39

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.39

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 47

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 47

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Office-554-Karachi

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify **:**Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.05

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 48

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 48

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Office-555-Lahore

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.95

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.8

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.8

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.15

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 49

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 49

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

PT36-Trujillo, Trujillo Levis Trujillo

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Peru
☑ Other, please specify :Pacific Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-8.115785

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-79.025738

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.08

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.07

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 50

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 50

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

PT51-Trujillo, Trujillo Dockers Trujillo

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Peru
☑ Other, please specify :Pacific Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-8.115785

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-79.025738

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.09

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.07

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 51

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 51

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Levi Pakistan

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.09

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.08

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.08

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 52

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 52

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20027110-FO Malir (Closed 53123)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

24.860734

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

67.001136

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.06

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.06

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 53

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 53

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20033055-Sargodha Levis

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.087855

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

72.647639

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.07

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.06

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.06

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 54

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 54

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20015702-Mall of Lahore (Closed 52623)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.04

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.04

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.04

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called ‘waste water treatment plant’ or ‘effluent treatment plant’ in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and ‘textile industry’ weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 55

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 55

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

20015702A-Mall of Lahore A (Closed 52623)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.52037

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

74.358747

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.02

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.02

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.02

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 56

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 56

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Akhtar Textile Industries (Unit 1)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

40

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

33.59

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 57

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 57

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Artistic Milliners (Unit 4)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

341.35

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

286.73

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

55

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 58

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 58

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Artistic Milliners (Unit 14)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

241

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

202.19

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

39

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 59

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 59

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Artistic Milliners (Unit 15)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

371

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

311.56

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

59

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 60

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 60

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Artistic Milliners - Denim (Unit 2)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

305

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

255.95

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

49

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 61

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 61

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Artistic Milliners - Denim (Unit 5)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

699

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

586.78

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

112

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 62

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 62

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arvind (Bommasandra)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :India East Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

25

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

20.64

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 63

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 63

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arvind (Mysore Road Gmt)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :India East Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

35

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

29.66

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 64

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 64

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arvind Smart Textiles

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

18

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

15.36

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 65

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 65

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arvind Mills (Naroda)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

325

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

273.09

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

52

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 66

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 66

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Arvind Woven (Santej)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

643

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

539.71

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

103

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 67

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 67

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Crescent Bahuman (CBL)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1070

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

898.71

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

171

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 68

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 68

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Combined Fabrics

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

453

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

380.11

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

72

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 69

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 69

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Cotton Web

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

533

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

447.32

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

85

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 70

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 70

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Indigo Textile

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

612

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

513.7

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

98

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 71

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 71

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Contratistas y Maquilas de Mexico (Planta de Terminado)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Verde

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

120

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

100.48

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

19

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 72

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 72

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Manufacturas Kaltex (Planta Mezclilla)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Verde

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1829

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1536

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

293

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 73

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 73

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Kassim Textiles

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

792

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

665.4

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

127

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 74

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 74

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Kohinoor Mills (Dyeing Division)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

923

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

775.19

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

148

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 75

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 75

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Naveena Export

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

179

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

150.64

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

29

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 76

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 76

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Nishat Mills

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1205

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1011.88

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

193

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 77

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 77

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Ozak Tekstil Konfeksiyon (Sanliurfa)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey
☑ Tigris & Euphrates

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

143

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

120.03

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

23

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 78

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 78

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Sapphire Fibres Limited (Denim Division)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

532

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

447.06

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

85

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 79

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 79

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Style Textile

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

193

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

162.51

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

31

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 80

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 80

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

US Apparel & Textile (Unit 2)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

459

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

385

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

73

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 81

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 81

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

US Apparel & Textile (Unit 5)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

402

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

338.04

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

64

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 82

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 82

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

US Denim Mills

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

804

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

675.55

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

129

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 83

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 83

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Weifang Lantian Textile

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

164

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

137.95

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

26

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called ‘waste water treatment plant’ or ‘effluent treatment plant’ in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and ‘textile industry’ weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 84

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 84

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Xingtai H&J Textiles

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

332

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

279.12

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

53

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 85

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 85

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Artistic Milliners (AM-16)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan
☑ Other, please specify :Arabian Sea Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

334

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

280.57

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

53

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 86

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 86

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Dezhou Yuanji Textile Co.

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Ziya He, Interior

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

249

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

208

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

40

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 87

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 87

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

LNJ Denim

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Mahi River

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

368

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

308.73

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

59

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 88

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 88

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Everblue Apparels

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :India East Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

68

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

57.15

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

11

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.

Row 89

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 89

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Style Textile (Manga)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Pakistan

☑ Indus

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3917

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3290.54

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

627

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

The scale used to measure this change is as follows: /- 0-3% About the Same; /- 4-10% Higher or Lower; /- 10% Much Higher or Much Lower. Withdrawals are estimated at this facility and consumptive use coefficients were used to estimate consumption. Withdrawals from third-party sources refers to local municipal suppliers. Discharges to third-party destinations refers to POTW, also called 'waste water treatment plant' or 'effluent treatment plant' in some regions in accordance with local regulations. The total discharge was calculated using this equation: Discharge Withdrawal – Consumption. The baseline water stress indicator and 'textile industry' weighting from the WRI Water Risk Atlas were used to define this area as water stressed.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We anticipate working with a third-party in the next 2 years to verify this data

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We anticipate working with a third-party in the next 2 years to verify this data

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not anticipate verifying this data because our analysis shows that this is not material to the business nor a significant impact area for the company.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We anticipate working with a third-party in the next 2 years to verify this data

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We do not anticipate verifying this data because our analysis shows that this is not material to the business nor a significant impact area for the company.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We anticipate working with a third-party in the next 2 years to verify this data

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We anticipate working with a third-party in the next 2 years to verify this data

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We anticipate working with a third-party in the next 2 years to verify this data
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP supply chain members buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

(9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.

Row 1

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 71

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Contratistas y Maquilas de Mexico (Planta de Terminado)

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

According to WRI Aqueduct, two of our suppliers in Mexico face significant water risk. Supplier facilities in this watershed are predominantly factories and mills and are vital links in our supply chain. If water risk forces any of these facilities to reduce or pause operations, 1% of LS&Co.'s product units could be temporarily impacted until production could be shifted.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 72

(9.4.1.2) Facility name

Manufacturas Kaltex (Planta Mezclilla)

(9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

According to WRI Aqueduct, two of our suppliers in Mexico face significant water risk. Supplier facilities in this watershed are predominantly factories and mills and are vital links in our supply chain. If water risk forces any of these facilities to reduce or pause operations, 1% of LS&Co.'s product units could be temporarily impacted until production could be shifted.

(9.4.1.5) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	6179000000	*12533468.56*	*As we continue to progress on the goals outlined in our 2025 Water Action Strategy, we expect our total water withdrawal efficiency to improve.*

[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

All LS&Co. products

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

Global revenue

(9.12.5) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*LS&Co. has a rigorous product quality testing program based on an industry-standard Restricted Substances List (RSL)*

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

The primary way that we validate that a product has a low-water impact is by using Jeanologia's Environmental Impact Measurement (EIM) software platform to measure and track progress at a product-level. EIM has a threshold for low-water impact that is 35 liters per garment or less in the finishing stage.

(9.14.4) Please explain

N/A

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*We are working with WaterAid in 2023 to develop a framework for 2030 WASH targets in our supply chain.*
Other	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*No other targets*

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in total water withdrawals

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

08/01/2019

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

11/30/2018

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

25725

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

11/30/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

12862

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

18722

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

54

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Water Resilience Coalition

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Applies to wet finishing key mills and vendor laundry factories located in watershed deemed high water stress. Excludes key or wet finishing factories not located in high water stress areas, non-key vendor factories, cut/sew factories, licensee factories, LFA, and Local for Local.

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

We are 54% towards our 2025 target of reducing our water use in manufacturing by 50% against a 2018 baseline as of FY 2023.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

This target shows our commitment to existing global environmental treaties regarding water stewardship and collective action. This target enhances our strategic operating mission and reduces risk by leading to less dependence on water resources in areas with high baseline water stress.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Other water pollution, please specify :Supplier Engagement - increase in number of suppliers engaged Water Pollution - number of facilities registered in ZDHC Wastewater module system for data collection purposes

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

08/01/2019

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

100

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC)

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This yearly recurring target includes the proportion of key facilities registered in the ZDHC Gateway Wastewater module. Key facilities are those that produce 80% of our product volume annually; the remainder of facilities are not in scope.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Continual engagement with facilities enabled us to achieve 100% target. Ongoing relationships with facilities.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

We set a recurring annual maintenance target to obtain 100% of in-scope facilities are registered in ZDHC Gateway Wastewater module. Progress made relative to base year matches anticipated progress. Target parameters are in line with the ZDHC Gateway Wastewater module. Facilities must meet the external standards set by this module.

[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards
☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Page 2 of LS&Co.'s verification statement includes verification of the underlying energy by source and facility type in MWh.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Levis_2023_VerificationStatement_V1-1_050224.pdf
[Add row]

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

	Additional information
	Please see www.levistrauss.com/sustainability for more information

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Financial and Growth Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:
☑ No