

Welcome to your CDP Climate Change Questionnaire 2020

C0. Introduction

C0.1

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

The Coca-Cola Company (NYSE: KO) is here to refresh the world and make a difference. We craft the brands and choice of drinks that people love. We do this in ways that create a more sustainable business. It's about working together to create a better shared future for our people, our communities and our planet.

The Coca-Cola Company is a total beverage company that markets, manufactures and sells beverage concentrates and syrups and finished beverages, offering over 500 brands and more than 4,700 products in over 200 countries and territories. In our concentrate operations, The Coca-Cola Company typically generates net operating revenues (\$37.3 billion in 2019) by selling concentrates and syrups to authorized bottling partners. Our bottling partners combine the concentrates and syrups with still or sparkling water and sweeteners (depending on the product), to prepare, package, sell and distribute finished beverages. Our finished product operations consist primarily of company-owned or -controlled bottling, sales and distribution operations. The 37 countries listed under question C0.3 are those countries in which The Coca-Cola Company owns and operates bottling plants.

In addition to the company's Coca-Cola brands, our portfolio includes some of the world's most valuable beverage brands, such as AdeS soy-based beverages, Ayataka green tea, Dasani waters, Del Valle juices and nectars, Fanta, Georgia coffee, Gold Peak teas and coffees, Honest Tea, innocent smoothies and juices, Minute Maid juices, Powerade sports drinks, Simply juices, smartwater, Sprite, vitaminwater and ZICO coconut water. We also operate retail outlets through Costa Limited, which operates nearly 4,000 coffeehouses in the United Kingdom, China and other markets across Europe, Asia Pacific, the Middle East and Africa. The company's portfolio also includes a coffee vending business, at home coffee solutions and a roastery.

Together with our approximately 225 bottling partners, we operate around 900 bottling plants, employ more than 700,000 people, and serve over 30 million retail customer outlets. in more than 200 countries. We refer to this as the 'Coca-Cola System'.

We know it's our responsibility to use our global scale for good. We're using our leadership to achieve positive change in the world and build a more sustainable future for our communities and our planet. We're doing this by taking action on our sustainable business priorities. These include providing consumers more beverage choices with less added sugar, rethinking our product packaging, replenishing water back to nature and communities and improving the

efficiency of water use and treatment of waste water to high standards, and reducing our carbon footprint across our value chain while helping our business and communities adapt to the impacts of climate change.

In 2013 we committed to reducing the carbon footprint of “the drink in your hand” by 25%, compared to 2010 levels, by 2020. By the end of 2019 we had achieved a reduction of our carbon footprint by 24 percent. In 2019 we raised our ambition and published a Science-Based Target for the Coca-Cola system, which aims to reduce absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions 25% by 2030 from a 2015 base-year. In 2019, 20-25% of carbon emissions were produced in our agriculture and ingredient supply chains, 25-30% in packaging, 10-15% in manufacturing, 5-10% in distribution, and 30-35% in cold drink equipment.

C0.2

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
Reporting year	January 1, 2019	December 31, 2019	No

C0.3

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

- Argentina
- Bangladesh
- Botswana
- Brazil
- Cambodia
- Canada
- Chile
- China
- Comoros
- Costa Rica
- Egypt
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- France
- Ghana
- India
- Indonesia
- Ireland
- Japan
- Kenya
- Malaysia
- Mayotte
- Mexico

Mozambique
Myanmar
Namibia
Nepal
Pakistan
Philippines
Puerto Rico
Republic of Korea
Singapore
South Africa
Sri Lanka
Turkey
Uganda
United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America
Viet Nam
Zambia

C0.4

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

USD

C0.5

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

Operational control

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

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

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

Consumption	Both direct operations and elsewhere in the value chain [Processing/manufacturing/Distribution only]
-------------	---

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

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

Row 1

Primary reason

Do not own/manage land

Please explain

At The Coca-Cola Company, we rely on agricultural ingredients for our products. However, the Company does not own or manage its own land, and agricultural ingredients are sourced through suppliers.

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

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

Agricultural commodity

Sugar

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

60-80%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

In addition to water, the principal raw materials used in our business are nutritive and non-nutritive sweeteners. In the United States, for example, the principal nutritive sweetener is high fructose corn syrup ("HFCS"), which is nutritionally equivalent to sugar. The principal nutritive sweetener used by our business outside the United States is sucrose, i.e., table sugar. Our selection of "sugar" above represents a combination of both HFCS and sucrose as described here.

We make our branded beverage products available to consumers globally through our network of Company-owned or controlled bottling and distribution operations, independent bottling partners, distributors, wholesalers and retailers. The Coca-Cola Company markets, manufactures and sells beverage concentrates, sometimes referred

to as “beverage bases,” and syrups, including fountain syrups (we refer to this part of our business as our “concentrate business” or “concentrate operations”), as well as finished sparkling soft drinks and other non-alcoholic beverages (we refer to this part of our business as our “finished product business” or “finished product operations”).

However, most of our branded beverage products are manufactured, sold and distributed by independent bottling partners, to whom The Company sells beverage concentrates. The nutritive sweeteners used in the finished products are therefore purchased, in some cases by The Company and in other cases by its independent bottling partners. This split of nutritive sweetener sourcing notwithstanding, the number stated above refers to the % of our finished product volumes that would be impacted in one way or another (directly or indirectly) by any material impact to this agricultural commodity.

Our Company generally has not experienced any difficulties in obtaining its requirements for nutritive sweeteners.

C1. Governance

C1.1

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

Yes

C1.1a

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

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board-level committee	The Public Policy and Sustainability Committee (PPSC) of the Company's Board of Directors bears the highest level of direct responsibility for climate-related issues within The Coca-Cola Company. The Committee assists the Board in overseeing the company's policies and programs and related risks to the company that concern regulatory, public policy, sustainability and corporate social responsibility matters, including progress against the company's sustainability goals. The Committee's scope includes oversight and monitoring of the company's progress against our 'drink in your hand' target, which is to reduce the carbon footprint of the Coca-Cola system by 25% by the end of 2020, against a 2010 baseline, and the establishment of our Science-Based Target which is to reduce absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions 25% by 2030 from a 2015 base-year. The Committee is also responsible for overseeing and responding to climate-related risks including physical risks from changes to weather and precipitation patterns, extreme weather events and water

	<p>scarcity which can disrupt/limit production and availability of ingredients and raw materials, and the risks of transition to a low-carbon economy including regulatory and reputational risks. The Committee reports regularly to the full Board on matters, including climate-related issues. The Committee has responsibility over climate issues because we believe that they have the potential to have a meaningful financial impact on the company and thus are a part of the Board's fiduciary duty. An example of a climate-related decision made by the committee in 2019 was their decision to align with management's recommended approach to set a science-based emissions reduction target for the Coca-Cola system.</p>
--	---

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Please explain
Scheduled – all meetings	<p>Reviewing and guiding strategy</p> <p>Reviewing and guiding major plans of action</p> <p>Reviewing and guiding risk management policies</p> <p>Reviewing and guiding annual budgets</p> <p>Reviewing and guiding business plans</p> <p>Setting performance objectives</p> <p>Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives</p> <p>Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures</p>	<p>Climate-related issues receive direct oversight from the Board because we believe that they have the potential to have a meaningful financial impact on the company and thus are a part of the Board's fiduciary duty.</p> <p>The Board reviews and provides guidance on risks via a well-defined Enterprise Risk Management process, into which climate-related risks are incorporated. The Board set as a priority for the Company's CEO the implementation of the World Without Waste initiative, with a goal to collect the equivalent of 100% of the bottles and cans we sell by 2030 (2020 Proxy, p. 5) The initiative also intends to increase the amount of available recycled PET (rPET), which will significantly reduce carbon emissions in the packaging production process. The charter of the Public Policy and Sustainability Committee (PPSC) states that as part of its authorities and responsibilities, the Committee will review the nature and scope of the Company's sustainability goals and the Company's progress toward achieving those goals.</p> <p>In 2019, the Board held six meetings, and the PPSC held four meetings in 2019 (2020 Proxy, p.28). The following climate-related issues were scheduled on the agenda for the PPSC's four meetings: An annual update on environmental trends specifically related to</p>

		<p>the Company's business, including a discussion on climate change; discussion of the Company's planned adoption of a science based target and approval to set this target; the Company's World Without Waste initiative; ESG Investing. As part of the preparation for the Committee's meetings, updates on priority sustainability issues were provided every two months in 2019 from the Global Public Affairs, Communications and Sustainability function, including information on actions and progress toward the company's Drink in Your Hand climate target. In 2019 the PPSC also received presentations on climate-related issues from the Chief Public Affairs, Communications and Sustainability Officer, the Director of Corporate Governance, and the Vice President for Environmental Sustainability and Social Impact.</p> <p>Review of climate-related issues was scheduled at one full-Board meeting in 2019, however the full Board is provided with a report from the chair of the PPSC about all matters discussed during each Committee meeting, so climate related matters were raised at the full board during that time even if they were not part of the formal agenda. Discussions held at full board meetings in 2019 included a discussion on the adoption of a science-based target and matters with climate-related impacts including water stewardship and plastic waste. During the board's regular sessions, they also hosted the CEO of one of our largest investors where a variety of issues were discussed, including climate change. To monitor performance against the Company's strategic goals and leadership objectives, the Board also actively engages in dialogue with our Company's senior leaders during each two-day board meeting.</p>
--	--	---

C1.2

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

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer		
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify SVP, Chief PAC & Sustainability Officer	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly

C1.2a

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

The Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is a combined position. The Chairman of the Board presides over meetings of the Board and shareowners and consults and advises the Board and its committees on the business and affairs of the Company. The Chairman also performs such other duties as may be assigned by the Board. The CEO is in charge of the affairs of the Company, subject to the overall direction and supervision of the Board and its committees and subject to such powers as reserved by the Board. It is the company's responsibility to use our global scale for good, to use our leadership to achieve positive change in the world and build a more sustainable future for our communities and our planet. Climate-related issues are part of achieving our company's purpose and we have to address it as part of the whole Coca-Cola system, therefore responsibility lies with the Chairman and CEO as the leader of the Company. The Chairman and CEO also has the necessary authority and decision-making power to take action to effectively manage climate related risks and opportunities to the business. In addition, this position is best able to identify issues, including climate-related issues, that require Board attention and, as Chairman, can best focus Directors' attention on the most critical business matters and allows for timely and unfiltered communication with the Board on critical business issues. The Chairman and CEO works directly with the Executive Leadership Team, including the Senior Vice President, Chief Public Affairs, Communications, and Sustainability Officer, to regularly assess and monitor progress on the company's sustainability goals, including those related to climate change, and evaluate and review information pertaining to social, political and environmental trends, including climate change. The Chairman and CEO identifies and raises critical business issues, which may include climate-related issues for discussion with senior leadership within the company and with the Board. The Chairman and CEO is also representing the company in working with a diverse group of stakeholders, such as the World Economic Forum and Consumer Goods Forum to eliminate the company's packaging waste and reduce our carbon footprint. In 2019, the Chairman and CEO drove innovation for PET recycling through the company's pilot of bottles made using recovered and recycled marine plastics, which have a lower carbon footprint than many other types of packaging.

The Senior Vice President, Chief Public Affairs, Communications, and Sustainability Officer is the corporate executive team member responsible for climate-related issues and reports directly to the Chairman and CEO and Board of Directors. Responsibility for climate-related issues lies with this position at the executive team level because this role leads the company's sustainability strategy and has the authority, and influence to effectively act on climate-related

issues. The Senior Vice President, Chief Public Affairs, Communications, and Sustainability Officer works directly with the Vice President for Global Public Policy, Environmental Sustainability, and Social Impact to set our global sustainability strategy and goals, including our science-based greenhouse gas emissions target and climate strategy and to track performance against those goals. The SVP also works with the VP to ensure coordination across Business Units, the sharing of best practices, and an open channel for informing and communicating with the Chairman & CEO and Board of Directors on climate-related risks and opportunities at the global level. The SVP also presents to the Public Policy and Sustainability Committee at least once a year, related to the accomplishment of the Company's sustainability goals, including our climate target.

C1.3

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

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

C1.3a

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

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Corporate executive team	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	<p>Our pay-for-performance philosophy awards executives in a way that motivates them to operate the Company's business in a profitable and sustainable manner. Our philosophy is built upon the understanding that there is a long-standing link between the sustainability of the communities we serve and the sustainability of our business. We also know that progress toward non-financial goals that are critical to our business and reflect our commitment to sustainability also adds value for our shareowners and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Both our Senior Vice President and Chief Communications, Public Affairs, Sustainability and Marketing Assets Officer and the Chief Technical Officer are part of the corporate executive team and their compensation is in part linked to the achievement of our emissions reduction target.</p> <p>Recognition of Individual Performance: Non-financial goals, including environmental and social goals, are critical to our business, reflect our external responsibility as global leaders, and add value for our shareowners and other</p>

			<p>stakeholders. In addition, individual performance against our culture and leadership behaviors are also taken into consideration in recognition of individual performance. Executives are motivated to deliver results that align with Company values and shareowner interests.</p>
--	--	--	--

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

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

Yes

C2.1a

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

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	2	
Medium-term	2	5	
Long-term	5	10	

C2.1b

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

We define ‘substantive impact’ as an event that will probably occur or we expect to occur within a three year horizon and has the potential to result in a materially adverse affect on our business, financial condition, results of our operations and result in significant loss to the environment or community services and well-being of the communities we serve.

The Company has robust internal processes and an effective internal control environment that facilitate the identification and management of risks. At a central level, this is conducted primarily by a robust, cross-functional and cross-company (including our bottling partners) Enterprise Risk Management program and Risk Steering Committee, which conducts regular assessments of risk, including an annual update of key enterprise risks. Potential risks factors are gathered from across all functions and organizations across the global system (group of organizations including our bottling partners), classified within a risk taxonomy of composed of 22 risk categories across 5 thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. Within these thematic areas and risk categories, the impact of climate change and sustainability issues are embedded as either risk

categories on their own, as key factors acting as multipliers or accelerators of existing business risk categories.

Each risk item is given a likelihood score and a consequence score, on a 5-point scale, 1 being the lowest, and 5 being the highest.

Based on the combination of likelihood score and consequence score, each potential risk event is ranked and management actions are considered.

On the likelihood scale, two factors are considered when determining the score: the estimated time horizon and the probability of the risk event. The risk event is then given a score of 1 to 5: (1 - Rare, 2 - Unlikely, 3 - Possible, 4 - Likely, 5 - Almost Certain)

On the consequence scale, each risk event is considered against 7 factors to arrive at the score: Financial, Strategy and Business Planning, Reputation, Political and Regulatory, Health Safety and Environment, Operational objectives, and People. The risk event is then given a score of 1 to 5: (1 - Insignificant, 2 - Minor, 3 - Moderate, 4 - Major, 5 - Critical)

In the consequence score, one of the 7 factors to provide input into the final score is Financial impact (as noted above). The thresholds to determine these inputs are: 1 (Insignificant) - less than 1% of Operating Income; 2 (Minor) - 2% of Operating Income; 3 (Moderate) - 3% of Operating Income; 4 (Major) - 4% of Operating Income; 5 (Critical) - greater than 5% of Operating Income.

In the likelihood score, the thresholds for time horizon are: 1 (Rare) - greater than 10 years, 2 (Unlikely) - 6 - 10 years, 3 (Possible) - 3 - 6 years, 4 (Likely) - 1 - 3 years, 5 (Almost Certain) - 0 - 12 months. The thresholds for probability are: 1 (Rare) - <10%, 2 (Unlikely) - 10 - 40%, 3 (Possible) - 41 - 70%, 4 (Likely) - 71 - 90%, 5 (Almost Certain) - >90%.

Any risk events that score 3 or above on both scales, or an equivalent score based on case-specific considerations are given attention for management actions discussion in the Risk Steering Committee.

C2.2

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

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term

Medium-term

Long-term

Description of process

Inherent in the Board's responsibilities is an understanding and oversight of the various risks facing the Company, including climate-related risks. Effective risk oversight is an important priority of the Board, which has implemented a risk governance framework designed to understand critical risks in the Company's business and strategy, allocate responsibilities for risk oversight among the full Board and its committees; evaluate the Company's risk management processes and whether they are functioning adequately, facilitate open communication between management and Directors, and foster an appropriate culture of integrity and risk awareness. The Board implements its risks oversight function both as a whole and through delegation to Board committees, which meet regularly and report back to the full Board.

The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors oversees the Enterprise Risk Management program and discusses all top risks at the April meeting of the Board of Directors each year. Then, in subsequent meetings the full Board of Directors and/or appropriate committees review in greater detail those risk themes which are deemed most significant.

While the Board and its committees oversee risk management, Company management is charged with managing risk. The Company has robust internal processes and an effective internal control environment that facilitate the identification and management of risks and regular communication with the Board.

This is conducted by a robust, cross-functional and cross-company (including bottling partners) Enterprise Risk Management program and Risk Steering Committee, which conducts regular assessments of risk, including an annual update of key enterprise risks. Potential risks factors are gathered from across all functions and organizations across the global system (group of organizations including our bottling partners) and external data sources, classified within a risk taxonomy of composed of 22 risk categories across 5 thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. Within these thematic areas and risk categories, the impact of climate change and sustainability issues are embedded as either risk categories on their own, as key factors acting as multipliers or accelerators of existing business risk categories.

Each risk item is given a likelihood score and a consequence score, on a 5-point scale, 1 being the lowest, and 5 being the highest.

Based on the combination of likelihood score and consequence score, each potential

risk event is ranked and management actions are considered.

On the likelihood scale, two factors are considered when determining the score: the estimated time horizon and the probability of the risk event. The risk event is then given a score of 1 to 5: (1 - Rare, 2 - Unlikely, 3 - Possible, 4 - Likely, 5 - Almost Certain)

On the consequence scale, each risk event is considered against 7 factors to arrive at the score: Financial, Strategy and Business Planning, Reputation, Political and Regulatory, Health Safety and Environment, Operational objectives, and People. The risk event is then given a score of 1 to 5: (1 - Insignificant, 2 - Minor, 3 - Moderate, 4 - Major, 5 - Critical)

Any risk events that scores 3 or above on both scales, or an equivalent score based on case-specific considerations, are given attention for management action discussion in the Risk Steering Committee. Relevant risks that could materially affect our business and financial results are disclosed in the Annual Report on Form 10-K. This includes risks and uncertainties relating to global climate change and its potential impacts to our business, such as those related to energy consumption, water consumption, process emissions and wastes, fleet operations, packaging waste, natural hazards, among many others.

Case study for Physical Risk:

In 2019, bush fires in Australia were discussed as a topic at the Risk Steering Committee. The 2019/20 bushfire season in Australia generated a heartbreaking loss of lives, land and wildlife. As of January 2020, 29 lives had been lost, nearly 6,000 buildings destroyed and 11 million hectares of land had been burned. The committee discussed the potential short and medium-term implications for the business, and supported the coordinated response of the business, which included a joint emergency relief package to help affected communities recover, by the The Coca-Cola Foundation, Coca-Cola Australia and our bottling partner Coca-Cola Amatil. Additionally, in response to a consumer's idea on social media, the Coca-Cola team created a limited edition "Share a Coke with the Firefighters" gift can as an expression of thanks to the fire fighters and volunteers. 120,000 cans were created exclusively to donate to volunteer fire organisations and fire-affected communities.

Case study for Transition Risk:

In 2019, the Risk Steering Committee discussed the results of our global water risk assessment, which updated our mapping of all bottling facility locations against the water stress level of the watersheds from which they withdraw water, according to the WRI Aqueduct tool. The committee discussed this topic in the context of potential future water-related regulations, increased operational disruptions and potential corporate reputational risk as a result of an expected acceleration of water risks due to climate change, and supported the further management of these risks within our global Water Stewardship program (represented in detail in the CDP Water response).

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

Risk management process

A specific climate-related risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term
Long-term

Description of process

The corporate sustainability function leads regular risk assessments specifically focused on climate-related risks, with engagement from experts and relevant functions across our global system of businesses, as well as external inputs. These global assessments are conducted roughly annually, and the results of these assessments are then further refined and adjusted on a regular basis throughout the year.

In 2017-2018, The Coca-Cola Company, in partnership with Business for Social Responsibility (BSR), conducted an assessment of climate-related risk to build a strategy framework for climate resilience across the TCCC global system and value chain. Over several months TCCC assessed key climate-related risks and opportunities via benchmarking against similar companies, internal interviews for assessment and alignment, a comprehensive resilience assessments of 7 key markets, and an assessment of two commodities particularly vulnerable to climate change.

In 2018-2019, building on our work with BSR, The Coca-Cola Company conducted a further climate-related risk priority assessment, to further refine our priority climate-related risks, according to the framework recommended by the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures. TCFD's recommended climate-related risks: 7 Physical Risks (6 Chronic, 1 Acute), and 18 Transition Risks (9 Policy & Legal, 3 Technology, 3 Market, 3 Reputation) were each assessed on their potential impact to 6 key value chain segments: (Ingredients, Packaging, Manufacturing, Distribution, Refrigeration, Communities and People).

The identified priority climate-related risks were:

(1) Changes to weather and precipitation patterns limiting the availability of ingredients and raw materials: The second highest potential exposure is from this risk, which has potential to impact a broad set of products and markets, with the potential to impact long-term growth strategies. For example, a total of USD 1.58 - 4.55 billion of revenue is currently dependent on corn from the United States that is grown in regions considered to have high - extremely high baseline water stress.

- (2) Extreme weather events disrupting production and limiting distribution: one-off extreme events pose significant potential impact resulting from significant off line periods or cost of activating alternative supply routes. These risks often have high visibility and carry reputational risk as well. For example, in 2017-2018, we estimate that Hurricane Maria caused losses of approximately USD 72 million to the business.
- (3) Water scarcity disrupting sourcing and/or production: The highest potential exposure is from this risk. Water is a critical ingredient to our products and essential in the production of many of our ingredients. Additionally, the communities in which we operate require adequate supplies of water. Disruption in the supply of available freshwater would create challenges across our value chains. We estimate that USD 946 million of revenue is dependent upon bottling facilities in India that operate in areas considered to have high baseline water stress.
- (4) GHG and/or water regulations increasing COGS (GHG) or disrupting production: At the moment, analyses indicate lower exposure on transition risks than on physical risks. Nonetheless, we estimate a USD 700 million potential exposure by 2030, based on calculations using the REMIND 2 degree scenario.

The results of these risk assessments are included in the corporate Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) risk process taxonomy, and through this, the impacts of climate change are captured at the enterprise risk level. For example, the company's ERM process informs the Business Continuity Planning (BCP) process to mitigate these impacts of climate change. With a dedicated business continuity manager at each of our concentrate production sites, the BCP process allocates at least 6,000 hours per year to risk management and planning, and their priorities are informed by the ERM process, which includes climate-change information.

As a case study for physical risk, in 2017-2018, Hurricane Maria caused significant damage to our bottling facility and concentrate production facility in Puerto Rico. Through ongoing planning informed by the BCP process, the local plant had invested for years in vertically integrating its supply chain, including the self-manufacturing of key packaging items to minimize dependence on the U.S. mainland for supplies, and the ability to produce CO₂ and some packaging items on site, as well as the capacity to store large amounts of key ingredients on site. As a result, the local Company and bottling partner facilities were able to restart production in less than 3 weeks following the disaster and provide aid to the communities in which they operate. As part of the Company's commitment to support our people and our communities during this difficult time, repairing the water treatment system constituted a priority, and once operational, we provided water to employees and to the city of Cidra as well. The city collected approximately 20,000 gallons (70,000 liters) of potable water a day from our facility. As a result, the overall loss to the system of Hurricane Maria is estimated at approximately USD 72 million.

As a case study for transition risk, the results of this risk assessment has helped our business assess the size of the potential impacts of carbon pricing and climate-related regulation, providing a critical input to the decision to set a Science Based Target for the reduction of our Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions as a business. Currently, the Coca-Cola

Company and its bottling partners are impacted directly or indirectly by some carbon pricing schemes. For example, the South African carbon tax introduced in 2019 impacts our bottling facilities in the country, with a net impact of USD 57,574 in 2019. Additionally, various regional or national schemes such as the EU ETS and other fuel taxes have an impact on some of our suppliers and bottling partners. TCCC conducted a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of a carbon pricing to our business, using the REMIND 2degrees scenario, and the IEA's World Energy Outlook "New Policies" as a Business As Usual scenario. Using the top end of the projected GHG emissions pricing range stated in the IEA scenario for 2030 as the low end of our range (USD 33/mT CO₂e), and the projected 2030 GHG emissions pricing stated in REMIND 2degree scenario (USD 68/mT CO₂e) for the high end of our range, we identified a potential impact of up to USD 700 million for our overall system, if no further action were taken in GHG emissions reduction. Our most significant mitigating action for this potential risk is to achieve our Science Based Target of reducing our scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions by 25% across our full value chain by 2030, against a 2015 baseline.

C2.2a

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

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Current regulation risk is assessed under the theme of Political and Regulatory.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of current regulation risk is: Waste and recycling (e.g. packaging regulations) Regulation deterring the use of plastic packaging may drive The Coca-Cola system towards increasing its use of more energy intensive packaging materials such as aluminium and glass, which in turn may increase the system's GHG emissions. In 2018, the Western state of Maharashtra in India adopted a single-use plastics ban. While PET bottles were exempted from this ban, this is an example in which a</p>

		<p>potential ban of plastic packaging for waste and litter management reasons, could have a drawback of increasing volumes of alternative packaging materials such as aluminum cans or glass bottles, which have a significantly higher carbon footprint.</p>
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Emerging regulation risk is assessed under the theme of Political and Regulatory.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of emerging regulation risk is: Increased regulation and prices on GHG emissions As more GHG emissions regulations emerge, and prices increase on existing schemes, there could be increasing impact on our business. Medium-to-long term risk of GHG pricing emerged as one of our top 8 climate-related risks, both from the standpoint of our own direct emissions at our facilities, and the cost of potential pricing to our suppliers and customers. For example, the South African carbon tax introduced in 2019 impacts our bottling facilities in the country, with a net impact of USD 57,574 in 2019. While the immediate impact to our business is low, we continue to monitor existing and emerging carbon pricing schemes at regional and national levels such as the EU ETS and national carbon taxes, RGGI, Canada's OBPS and FFC, and China's planned ETS, to understand both the direct and indirect impacts of these schemes. If these schemes do not impact our facilities directly, they could impact our fuel and energy prices, or the costs of production of raw materials, impacting our business indirectly.</p>
Technology	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Technology risk is assessed under the themes of Strategic and Reputational, Operational, and Macro / Economic, and includes such</p>

		<p>risks as increased requirements for investment in our supply base of equipment vendors, and ongoing associated costs to our system.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of Technology risk is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs to transition to lower emissions technology <p>In the US, ongoing reductions to the maximum daily energy consumption quota of our refrigeration equipment are applied every 3-4 years, driving requirements for investment in our supply base, and ongoing associated costs to our system.</p> <p>Refrigeration equipment, such as vending machines, coolers and fountain equipment form a significant part of our emissions, as well as being a critical component of our product distribution infrastructure. In the United States, our refrigeration equipment is subject to both voluntary and mandatory energy consumption standards. The Environmental Protection Agency's Energy STAR program provides ratings for energy-efficient refrigeration equipment, against which many of our customers require compliance. In addition, the Department of Energy's Conservation Standards for Beverage Vending Machines and Refrigeration Equipment reduces the maximum daily energy consumption quota of this equipment every 3-4 years, driving requirements for investment in our supply base, and ongoing associated costs to our system.</p>
<p>Legal</p>	<p>Relevant, always included</p>	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Legal risk is assessed under the themes of Strategic and Reputational, and Political and Regulatory.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of Legal risk is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compliance with legal regulations <p>This risk is assessed against not only GHG emissions-related issues,</p>

		<p>but other relevant areas that may have direct or indirect links to climate change, such as packaging or water regulation. Compliance to legal requirements is non-negotiable and therefore the expectation is for any areas where a legal breach may result, we must capture in our local, or global risk assessments.</p> <p>An example of a change in law is in the EU, where in 2019, the European Green New Deal was announced, and with that, the European Commission published its circular economy action plan. In parallel, member states such as France have adopted specific regulations, such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of single-use plastic bottles put on the market should be reduced by 50% by 2030 - The end of single-use plastic packaging by 2040 - An amendment providing that France should adopt a national trajectory to increase the share of reused packaging by 5% of on all beverage packaging placed on the market in 2023 and by 10% in 2027 was also adopted. <p>These measures would all impact The Coca-Cola Company's products.</p>
Market	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Market risk is assessed under the themes Strategic and Reputational, and Macro / Economic.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>Examples of Market risk are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased cost of raw materials - Uncertainty in market signals <p>Our assessment of market risk did not emerge as a major risk area for our business. However, there is potential that climate change impacts may increase the cost of certain raw materials through various regulations and uncertainties, or through damage or losses in efficiency due to climate change impacts.</p> <p>Variations in supply and demand at global or regional levels could impact the price and availability of raw materials and materials needed</p>

		<p>for our products. In particular, a potential increase in the prices, or limitation in the availability of key raw materials could increase our cost base, which may or may not be passed onto customers and consumers. In 2020, as a result of the COVID-19 crisis, global oil prices plummeted drastically, creating an imbalance in the market for recycled PET plastic in our packaging. Our business remains committed to our goal of using 50% recycled material in our primary consumer packaging by 2030, and our teams have made significant adjustments to our tactics and strategy in order to remain on track. The nature of this market shift, as a sudden and unexpected event, is analogous to how our experts indicate climate change impacts may affect the market. In addition, as a business, we will remain committed to our climate-related goals even as we experience shifts in the market.</p>
<p>Reputation</p>	<p>Relevant, always included</p>	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Reputation risk is assessed under the theme Strategic and Reputational, and People.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>Examples of reputational risks are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shifts in consumer preferences in response to how company is handling climate risk - Stigmatization of sector <p>Reputational risk emerged as a potential long-term risk for the company. There is reputational risk due to consumers possibly associating the company and sector with water stress, fossil fuel use (through plastics or in production) and other climate-related challenges. This possible association may impact sales as purchase decisions could be impacted by this association. Our internal research suggests that our consumers are becoming increasingly interested in the environmental and social aspects of our beverages. They want to know not only what's in their beverages, but how they were produced, where the ingredients originated and how they were grown (social and environmental practices). In a recent survey, "environmentally sound</p>

		<p>manufacturing" was identified as a top 3 issue for consumers, after product safety and job creation, with 28% of respondents agreeing that it is a salient sustainability issue. Furthermore, "environmentally sound manufacturing" was associated overwhelmingly with the amount of GHG emissions in manufacturing. Additionally, the recent climate protests have succeeded in putting climate change and the engagement of corporations in this debate in the forefront of public awareness.</p>
<p>Acute physical</p>	<p>Relevant, always included</p>	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Acute physical risk is assessed under the themes People and Operational.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of Acute physical risk is Extreme weather events including storms, hurricanes, floods & extreme drought - The most significant potential impact to the system from one-off extreme events is disruption to manufacture and distribution. Damage to key concentrate production or bottling plants could result in off line periods and reduced supply. One-off events can impact crop availability in certain areas, and disrupt consumers in the specific area of the event. However, as a global company buying ingredients and raw materials in bulk from various regions, and selling across the world, these one-off events are generally considered less material. These risks often have high visibility and carry reputational risk as well. For example, in 2017-2018, Hurricane Maria caused significant damage to our bottling facility and concentrate production facility in Puerto Rico. Through ongoing planning informed by the BCP process, the local Company and bottling partner facilities were able to restart production in less than 3 weeks following the disaster and provide aid to the communities in which they operate. As part of the Company's commitment to support our people and our communities during this difficult time, repairing the water treatment system constituted a priority, and once operational, we provided water to employees and to the city of Cidra as well. The city collected approximately 20,000 gallons (70,000 liters) of potable water a day from our facility. As a result, of</p>

		these activities, the overall loss to the system of Hurricane Maria is estimated at approximately USD 72 million.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Chronic physical risk is assessed under the themes Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of chronic physical risk is: - Water scarcity (including changes in precipitation patterns) As climate change impacts affect levels of water stress and water scarcity, changes to water availability for key facilities can have implications for production capacity. Water scarcity can also have implications for quality and availability of key ingredients and packaging raw materials, which has potential to impact a broad set of products and markets, with the added potential to impact long-term growth strategies. For example, we estimate that currently USD 1.58 - 4.55 billion of revenue is from products that depend on corn from the United States that is grown in regions considered to have high - extremely high baseline water stress, and any significant variability in the availability of corn could impact products and strategies in this market .</p>

C2.3

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

Yes

C2.3a

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

Identifier

Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical

Changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns

Primary potential financial impact

Increased direct costs

Company-specific description

The Coca-Cola Company conducted a climate-related risk priority assessment, to refine our priority climate-related risks, according to the framework recommended by the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures. Assessment was conducted along TCFD's recommended climate-related risks: 7 Physical Risks (6 Chronic, 1 Acute), and 18 Transition Risks (9 Policy & Legal, 3 Technology, 3 Market, 3 Reputation), and these were each assessed on their potential impact to 6 key value chain segments: (Ingredients, Packaging, Manufacturing, Distribution, Refrigeration, Communities and People) across a 10-year timescale, through a host of internal and external information and interviews.

One of the identified top priority climate-related risks was "Changes to weather and precipitation patterns limiting the availability of ingredients and raw materials." The second highest potential exposure was from this risk, which has potential to impact a broad set of products and markets, with the potential to impact long-term growth strategies.

Our business uses a significant volume of corn-derived sweetener, high fructose corn syrup, as a sweetener in our beverages in many of our key markets. On average, 71% by volume of our beverage products contain some amount of sugar or corn-derived sweetener, globally. In the United States, these products use corn-derived sweeteners exclusively. If the production of corn is impacted, a significant portion of our product portfolio in this market will be directly impacted, through cost and availability impacts of this key ingredient.

This specific risk item focuses on our purchased corn-derived sweeteners, which are grown in the United States. Based on our climate-related priority risk assessment, we understand that the chronic physical impacts of climate change, namely changes in precipitation patterns, temperature variability and changes in weather patterns, are expected to have a significant impact on our agricultural supply chains. If we take the exposure of this specific supply chain, our exposure as a business would be on the products in our US market, which contain high-fructose corn syrup as a sweetener.

We therefore consider the climate change impacts and the associated impact on water and weather-related risks in the growing (i.e. sourcing) of this raw material to be a critical risk to monitor and understand.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

1,580,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

4,552,000,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

This is the amount of current revenue that is dependent specifically on corn sourced from the United States, which is the scope of this risk calculation.

Assumptions below:

- Net operating revenue (public data) for North America Operating Group is used as an input.
- USA revenue breaks down proportional to its UC volume share within the NA OG.
- Global percentage of low or no-calorie beverages in our portfolio (29%) is applicable as an average to the USA market.
- Low end of range = exposed to risk only in locations of extremely high water stress.
- High end of range = exposed to risk in locations of both high and extremely high water stress.

Estimated exposure was calculated by taking North America Operating Group revenue, multiplying the volume share of USA, and further applying % of portfolio that use corn-derived sweetener, based on assumption above. We then multiply the % of our corn that we believe may be exposed to risk due to water stress based on climate change impacts.

Cost of response to risk

100,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

In 2013, we set a goal to more sustainably source our priority ingredients by 2020. Corn is one of our priority ingredients, in the form of High Fructose Corn Syrup. We require that our suppliers meet our 15 Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP), which establish the framework for progress and are integrated into governance procurement

processes.

As a case study specifically on corn, we advance our sustainable sourcing through membership in Field to Market: The Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture, through which we work on more sustainable corn production in the United States. With our four biggest corn suppliers, we are aiming to fulfill a 2014 commitment to expand the application of Field to Market's Fieldprint® Platform, a data-driven tool that quantifies water use, energy use, greenhouse gas emissions and other measures of sustainability performance. The target is to engage corn farmers representing 1 million acres by 2020, which would position The Coca-Cola Company with 100% more sustainable corn production in the U.S. market. As a result of such work, our global % of corn sourced from sustainable sources has moved into the 51 - 75% range, up from 0 - 25% in 2016 and 2017.

The cost of response to this risk is USD 200,000 and is the total annual contribution from The Coca-Cola Company's to select platforms such as Field to Market, or the SAI platform to promote the advancement of sustainable sourcing of corn and raise awareness at a global level. Specifically, on Field to Market mentioned in our case study above, our annual investment is USD 50,000, which is directed to both the promotion of sustainable agriculture, as well as awareness raising and other support for the Field to Market platform.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical

Other, please specify

Water scarcity and availability

Primary potential financial impact

Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

Company-specific description

The Coca-Cola Company conducted a climate-related risk priority assessment, to refine our priority climate-related risks, according to the framework recommended by the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures. Assessment was conducted along TCFD's recommended climate-related risks: 7 Physical Risks (6 Chronic, 1 Acute), and 18 Transition Risks (9 Policy & Legal, 3 Technology, 3 Market, 3 Reputation), and these were each assessed on their potential impact to 6 key value chain segments:

(Ingredients, Packaging, Manufacturing, Distribution, Refrigeration, Communities and People) across a 10-year timescale, through a host of internal and external information and interviews.

One of the identified top priority climate-related risks was: "Water scarcity disrupting sourcing and/or production." The highest potential exposure was from this risk. Water is a critical ingredient for more than 99% of our products and essential in the production of many of our ingredients, particularly our agricultural ingredients, for which we identify 13 key ingredients in our sustainable agriculture program. Additionally, the communities in which we operate require adequate supplies of water.

In 2018, in parallel with the climate-related risk assessment above, we worked with WRI on a global Enterprise Water Risk Assessment, including all production facilities globally and 9 of our priority commodities and their sourcing regions. In light of the climate-related risks identified in our assessment, this work provides a holistic, global view of our exposure to systemic water related hazards, including baseline water stress, projected water stress to 2030, water quality challenges and access to water and sanitation (WASH) challenges, for direct operations and key agricultural commodities.

Based on this assessment, India is the geography with the largest number of facilities owned by The Coca-Cola Company exposed to potential baseline water stress risk. 10 facilities in India were identified to be located in areas of high or extremely high baseline water stress, spread across Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Rajasthan, Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. This response focuses on this market.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

811,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

946,000,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

The amount listed here is the value of current business revenue that is dependent on the 10 production facilities in India, owned by The Coca-Cola Company, located in areas considered to be under high or extremely high baseline water stress.

Assumptions below:

- Net operating revenue (publicly reported) for the BIG Operating Group is used as a starting point.
- Assumes that revenue impact breaks down proportional to share of volume produced at a production facility. Much of this volume information is publicly available information.
- The low end of the range assumes that only locations with Extremely High water stress are exposed.
- The high end of the range assumes that locations with both High and Extremely High water stress are exposed.
- Estimated exposure was calculated by taking BIG Operating Group revenue, multiplying the volume share of India, and further multiplying the proportion of total volume of the market, that are produced at the facilities in focus.

Cost of response to risk

300,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

We closely monitor the impact of our water use, and require all plants to comprehensively evaluate local source water vulnerabilities and risk. Each facility is required to complete a comprehensive risk assessment, composed of 72 risk factors across 21 risk categories on water-related issues, in which the salient issues surrounding its operations are comprehensively addressed. The local teams then take the results of this risk assessment, and implement mitigation and management plans.

In India, 9 of our Company-owned bottling facilities lie in areas that are considered to be under Extremely High, or High water stress, according to the WRI's aqueduct tool. As such, we invest in activities to manage and mitigate these risks, which focus on increasing water availability and increasing water efficiency. For example, at Mehandiganj plant in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh, local NGOs and Hindustan Coca-Cola installed the first rainwater harvesting project nearly 15 years ago. Since then, the partnership has commissioned 38 rainwater harvesting structures to recharge ground water in areas of need. Additionally, we continue to improve water efficiency in all of our facilities in India, by introducing water reuse technology. Furthermore, since 2009, Anandana—The Coca-Cola India Foundation—has created more than 13 billion liters of water replenishment potential through 150 community water conservation projects, impacting over 600,000 lives across 500+ villages in remote and water-stressed areas across the country. The projects emphasize community participation with a focus on women, who often reach supervisory roles in village “Pani Samitis” (water committees), to ensure the maintenance and sustainability of the community water projects.

In 2019, we conducted 326 projects worldwide to restore watersheds and help replenish the equivalent amount of water we withdraw from these watersheds into our products. As a result, we replenished 161% of the volume of water we used in our

beverages, equating to approximately 274 billion liters, through ecosystem restoration and watershed remediation projects. The cumulative volume of water replenished since this program was announced more than a decade ago, is over 1.5 trillion liters of water, and the cumulative cost of these projects is indicated above as "Cost of response to risk." The calculation is the sum of the project budgets for these projects, which exceeds USD 300,000,000.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation
Carbon pricing mechanisms

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

The Coca-Cola Company conducted a climate-related risk priority assessment, to refine our priority climate-related risks, according to the framework recommended by the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures. Assessment was conducted along TCFD's recommended climate-related risks: 7 Physical Risks (6 Chronic, 1 Acute), and 18 Transition Risks (9 Policy & Legal, 3 Technology, 3 Market, 3 Reputation), and these were each assessed on their potential impact to 6 key value chain segments: (Ingredients, Packaging, Manufacturing, Distribution, Refrigeration, Communities and People) across a 10-year timescale, through a host of internal and external information and interviews.

One of the identified top priority climate-related risks was: "GHG regulations increasing COGS or disrupting production." Currently, the Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners are impacted directly or indirectly by some carbon pricing schemes. For example, the South African carbon tax introduced in 2019 impacts our bottling facilities in the country, with a net impact of USD 57,574 in 2019. Additionally, various regional or national schemes such as the EU ETS and other fuel taxes have an impact on some of our suppliers and bottling partners. TCCC conducted a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of a carbon pricing to our business, using the REMIND 2degrees scenario, and the IEA's World Energy Outlook "New Policies" as a Business As Usual scenario.

There are currently only a handful of GHG emissions pricing policies or schemes in which the Food and Beverage sector is directly covered. As it relates to our Scope 2

and 3 emissions, many of the key commodities that we source are, or will be covered in carbon pricing policies. Therefore, our analyses indicate low exposure today, though in the long-term, we expect that the impact to the business could become significant, if no emissions reductions activities were to be taken.

If more carbon pricing policies are introduced around the world and the existing schemes continue to increase the equivalent cost per tonne of carbon, these costs either impact our system as direct costs, or as indirect costs through increased prices of our key sourced commodities, such as energy, metal, plastic, glass and others. On the other hand, carbon pricing schemes could support the business and global community to achieve desired emissions reduction goals. Therefore, we consider this to be a significant opportunity as well.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

68,640,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

735,930,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

The stated figure is an estimate, based on our estimated business-as-usual emissions scenario in 2030, which assumes no emissions reduction activity or intervention between now and 2030. The figure is an estimate for the annual oncost to the system as a result of potential GHG emissions pricing policies.

We have used the top end of the projected GHG emissions pricing range stated in the IEA's World Energy Outlook "New Policies" scenario for 2030 as the low end of our range (USD 33/mT CO₂e), and we have used the projected 2030 GHG emissions pricing stated in REMIND IAM 2degree scenario (USD 68/mT CO₂e) for the high end of our range.

For direct emissions, we applied these prices assuming that 50% - 100% of our operations globally will be covered.

For indirect emissions, we applied a percentage range of these prices, assuming that a

not-negligible portion of the increased costs will be passed on through the supply chain to our global system.

Cost of response to risk

305,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

Our emissions reduction target, to reduce the carbon footprint of the "Drink In Your Hand" by 25% from 2010 to 2020, has helped to mitigate both our emissions in our direct operations, as well as the consumption of energy and emissions across our value chain. Additionally, the results of this risk assessment has helped our business assess the size and opportunity of the potential impacts of carbon pricing and climate-related regulation, and was a critical input to the decision to set a Science Based Target for the reduction of our Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. Both our legacy goal and our new SBT include the emissions of all of our bottling partners. We jointly pursue these targets through joint governance structures, and by aligning the targets of our regions and bottling partners with ours.

As a case study, in 2019, the South African government introduced a carbon tax, covering our sector. Our current tax impact is limited but primarily comes from fuel usage at our bottling facilities, which are primarily used as inputs to thermal heating and on-site electrical generation equipment, as well as gas & LNG vehicles such as forklifts. In anticipation of this tax, the Coca-Cola-Company-owned bottler Coca-Cola Beverages South Africa announced its intention to have 25% of its electricity powered by renewable sources by 2025. The first 10% of this capacity, about 18-million kwh/year, was rolled out across 11 of our sites through rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) units, with combined installed capacity of 10.6 MW, partly replacing legacy on-site generation capacity, using fossil fuels. More specifically, in our Bloemfontein plant, in which these photovoltaic units have been installed, local teams are also exploring with suppliers to replace gas-powered forklifts with electric forklifts, which would be linked to solar PV stations.

Currently, roughly 10% of our overall global emissions come from our manufacturing. Based on the incremental renewable energy use required across our global bottling system to reduce this amount to target levels, we estimate that the total cost of implementing this intervention would be approximately USD 165 million of capital outlay and USD 70 - 140 million incremental annual operating costs across our system (including bottlers) assuming that this would be achieved with a mix of installed generation and purchase agreements. The cost of response to this risk is represented as a sum of the Capex and Opex costs, 165 + 140 = 305 million.

Comment

C2.4

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

Yes

C2.4a

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

Identifier

Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Downstream

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of recycling

Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description

Bottlers of our beverage products presently offer and use nonrefillable recyclable containers in various markets around the world. Some of these bottlers also offer and use refillable containers, which are also recyclable. Legal requirements apply in various jurisdictions requiring that deposits or certain ecotaxes or fees be charged in connection with the sale, marketing and use of certain beverage containers. While the precise requirements imposed by these measures vary, if these measures are designed in a way that effectively increases the collection and recycling of nonrefillable containers, supports the use of increased recycled content in our packaging and supports the efficient use of refillable containers where they are used, we consider this as an opportunity to drive towards our 2030 goals to collect one package for every one we put on the market and include an average of 50% recycled content all of our primary packaging globally, driving a significant reduction in emissions associated with the packaging of our products, which we currently report within our Scope 3 emissions.

Specifically, packaging accounts for roughly one third of the carbon footprint across our value chain. Of this one third, our calculations show that roughly half can be attributed to aluminum cans and just under a quarter each can be attributed to plastic and glass. While the exact figure is dependent on the packaging material as well as the technology and infrastructure in use, recycling saves a significant amount of energy and emissions in comparison with virgin materials. In addition, in specific markets, we are finding that consumers indicate a preference towards products that are recyclable and use recycled material in their packaging design. In many markets, refillable packaging appears to show a similar trend. There is a potential opportunity for increased consumer relevance

and, as a consequence, increased revenues resulting from designing recyclable packaging that uses recycled material, engaging on packaging collection and recycling, as well as offering refillable packaging options in appropriate markets.

Furthermore, in light of the focus on this issue in the media and by civil society actors and consumers, our continued engagement and ambitious goal setting in this area will not only help to reduce emissions within our value chain, but also serve to protect corporate reputation and the value of our brands.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

373,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

Approximately 88% of our volume is currently being served in recyclable packaging. We estimate that 60% of that amount is currently being collected for recycling and/or refill. Additionally, we are currently using an average of 20% recycled material in our packaging, across all of our consumer-facing primary packaging.

By working to collect and recycle the outstanding amount, use more recycled material and provide packaging options preferable to consumers, we believe this unlocks opportunities for further growth of our business. The amount above indicates the approximate potential financial impact, for every 1% of revenue growth, based on 2019 operating revenue. This does not mean that we expect this amount of growth. This number is simply a benchmark for further calculations and estimates.

Cost to realize opportunity

5,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Our strategy to realize this opportunity is our World Without Waste program, announced in 2018, with the following goals that apply globally across our company and system of

bottling partners:

- (1) Make 100% of our packaging recyclable globally by 2025—and use at least 50% recycled material in our packaging by 2030.
- (2) Collect and recycle a bottle or can for each one we sell by 2030.
- (3) Work together to support a healthy, debris-free environment.

In 2019 we made significant progress, through a governance structure of dedicated cross-functional teams and program leads within each of our geographical business units, as well as a core cross-functional team at our corporate center, including the office of the COO, Public Affairs, Communications and Sustainability, R&D, Technical and Supply Chain, Procurement and Finance functions.

The cost to realize opportunity: In 2019 we invested more than \$5 million in community recycling education initiatives across the world on top of our investments in recycling and collection infrastructure and worked with partners to implement recycling education programs across 15 markets, reaching more than 28 million people and resulting in over 60,000 tons of plastic bottles collected for recycling. \$5 million is the sum total of the budget of these projects, specifically related to recycling education and awareness-raising.

A long list of projects across the globe, each with varying levels of investment, drive progress of our overall program beyond education and awareness raising. Some highlights of our activity in 2019 can be found here:

<https://www.coca-colacompany.com/content/dam/journey/us/en/reports/coca-cola-world-without-waste-report-2019.pdf>

Case Study:

Coca-Cola Brazil invested US\$25 million to design and create a reusable bottle with a universal design that could be utilized across multiple brands. Coca-Cola Brazil invested another US\$400 million in cleaning and refilling facilities that allow the bottles to be returned, cleaned, and refilled up to 25 times. As a result, in Brazil all 2-liter bottles across Coca-Cola, Fanta, and Sprite brands are sold in bottles that are the same color, shape, and size, which increases the efficiency of collection, cleaning, and filling. The reusable bottles are replacing 200 million nonrefillable bottles each year, and they have contributed to the strongest performance of Coca-Cola Brazil in 7 years, in which the business grew more than twice the rate of consumer spending.

Comment

Identifier

Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Energy source

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

The Coca-Cola Company's syrup and juice production plants, bottling plants, and distribution facilities, as well as our independent bottling partners' bottling plants and distribution facilities use a significant amount of electricity, natural gas and other energy sources for operation. An increase in the price, disruption of supply or shortage of fuel and other energy sources in countries in which we have concentrate plants, or in any of the major markets in which our Company-owned or -controlled bottlers, or independent bottling partners' bottling plants operate, would increase our operating costs and negatively impact our profitability.

Across our entire Coca-Cola system, driven by the potential for increased energy security, financial incentives, or through emissions reduction and sustainability considerations, both our own operating facilities and some of our major bottling partners have invested in renewable energy projects, with some of our major bottling partners announcing renewable energy and electricity targets. One example of a bottling partner within the Coca-Cola System making important progress is Coca-Cola Amatil in Fiji, which has launched a project in 2017 that generates around 40 percent of its Suva manufacturing facility's total energy requirements from the sun, following the installation of over 3,860 solar panels on the roof of the building. The 1.1 megawatt solar system produces 1,408,000 kilowatt hours of energy per year, saving 974 tons of CO₂ annually – the equivalent of saving 414,722 liters of diesel per year or planting 24,964 trees. When the second stage of the project is complete, it is anticipated 80 percent of the site's energy needs will be solar powered.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

35,211,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

145,112,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

The figures above are potential savings based on our possible exposure to GHG emissions pricing in the future. On our direct and Scope 2 emissions, based on our current estimates of how GHG emissions pricing policies may affect our system in the future, we expect that a conversion to renewable energy will avoid the costs above, in the year 2030. The numbers above are not cumulative, but is the per annum cost.

We used future projections of emissions in the year 2030 for both our Scope 1 and 2 emissions, and compared them with a scenario of renewable energy transition within our system. Using top end of carbon price projections for 2030 in the IEA WEO New Policies scenario as the low end of our range, and carbon prices for 2030 in the REMIND IAM 2C scenario as the high end of our range, we calculated this estimated avoidance of cost.

Cost to realize opportunity

305,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

In 2013, we set a goal to reduce GHG emissions across our full value chain. This goal has proven a worthy ambition as we managed to cut our Scope 1, 2 and 3 carbon footprint per unit of sales by 24% toward our target of a 25% reduction by the end of 2020, against a 2010 baseline. In 2019 we published a Science-Based Target for the Coca-Cola system, which aims to further decrease our carbon footprint across the system. Our target is to reduce the absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions 25% by 2030 from a 2015 base-year.

One of our key interventions to achieve our target and avoid future impacts of carbon pricing is to invest in renewable energy, and as such many of our business units have made investments.

As a case study, CPS, the concentrate arm of Coca-Cola, has 9 live renewable energy projects across 7 plants. In 2017, the solar installation in Pakistan went live, providing about 9% of the plant's total energy, and in India, 7% of the plant's total energy use and more than 10% of electricity comes from the new solar installation. This will double when the additional solar panels begin producing in the second phase of the project.

Many of our bottling partners have implemented ambitious renewable electricity or energy goals, and many have achieved significant volumes to date. Coca-Cola European Partners has built a solar farm to supply part of its electricity demand to the Wakefield factory in Northern England, the largest soft drinks production facility in Europe. The solar farm now supplies approximately 15% of the site's electricity, and although all the electricity we buy in Western Europe is renewable, this

site was developed to feed our Wakefield factory directly and support the local community. CCEP takes all of the output from the solar farm directly into their factory.

Cost to realize opportunity:

Currently, roughly 10% of our overall emissions come from manufacturing & production. Based on the incremental renewable energy use required across our bottling system to reduce this amount to target levels, we estimate that the total cost of implementing this intervention would be approximately USD 165 million of capital outlay and USD 70 - 140 million incremental annual operating cost, across the full Coca-Cola system, assuming that this would be achieved with a mix of installed generation and purchase agreements. The cost of response to this risk is represented as a sum of the Capex and Opex costs, $165 + 140 = 305$ million.

Comment

Identifier

Opp3

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Downstream

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description

As a beverage company, sustainable refrigeration is a key opportunity for The Coca-Cola Company. International agreements may include mandatory requirements and/or incentives that increase the return of low-carbon technology investments. Future regulations on energy pricing may impact company operations and make our energy efficiency and renewable energy investments more competitive; climate change regulations could influence the cost of refrigerants and improve the return of our eKOfreshment (sustainable refrigeration) program.

Refrigeration is the single biggest estimated source of our system's carbon emissions footprint. Of our total Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, GHG emissions from cooling equipment consistently accounts for about 1/3. The company has approached this as an innovation opportunity and has worked to improve the environmental performance of our refrigeration equipment. Since 2000, we have improved our cooling equipment energy efficiency by 40 percent; and we have eliminated 75 percent of direct greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by transitioning to HFC-free insulation foam for new equipment.

With many of our retail customers under increasing cost pressure and greater scrutiny for their sustainability and environmental performance, the ability to deliver more energy-efficient, environmentally friendly coolers is a key focus of strategic importance for The Coca-Cola Company and many of our bottling partners.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

373,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

Strong partnerships with our customers are key in driving the success of our business. Given that a vast majority of our cold drinks equipment are on-site at our customers' retail outlets, reputational and energy efficiency gains from our cold drinks equipment initiatives will have a positive impact on our partnerships with customers and with consumers.

With each 1% of revenue growth that this opportunity could drive, the financial impact is listed above, based on our 2019 net operating revenue.

Cost to realize opportunity

100,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

A major focus for improvement has been phasing out hydrofluorocarbon (HFCs) refrigerants, using natural refrigerant fluids, in our cold-drink equipment across our global value chain. In 2019, The Coca-Cola Company and its bottlers introduced 918,009 units of HFC-free refrigeration equipment, adding up to a total of around 5 million HFC-free coolers and vending machines that we have introduced into the marketplace since the program began.

In addition, we have more than 5.6 million intelligent energy management devices in use

on our refrigeration equipment, reducing customer electricity consumption and saving them an estimated \$400 million annually and delivering corresponding emissions reductions of approximately 3.1 million metric tons per year.

Case Study:

In the wake of the March 2011 Tohoku earthquake and tsunami, Japan experienced scheduled blackouts. These blackouts affected Coca-Cola's nearly 1 million vending machines installed in the country, affecting the ability to provide cold drinks to customers. In response, Coca-Cola's Tokyo R&D division set out to design a machine that could dispense cold drinks after being shut down for up to 16 consecutive hours. The result was the "Peak Shift" vending machine. This machine is designed to only use power for cooling at night when electricity demand is lower and electricity systems experience fewer demand issues. The machines keep drinks cold while reducing daytime energy use by 95% and consuming 10% less energy overall than an average machine. This model is now standard for new vending machines installed in Japan.

The cost to realize opportunity is USD 100,000,000, based on the total figure for the amount of project-based budget invested to make our coolers more environmentally responsible and energy efficient. Since 2010, the aggregate sum of project budgets invested to develop more sustainable and energy efficient coolers exceed USD 100,000,000. We have certified 280 cooler models as meeting our performance standards. More than three-quarters of these certified models are more energy-efficient than legacy models, and 60 percent have a higher cooling capacity. Nearly 40 percent are certified to perform in hot or humid conditions.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

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

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

C3.1a

(C3.1a) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?

Yes, qualitative and quantitative

C3.1b

(C3.1b) Provide details of your organization's use of climate-related scenario analysis.

Climate-related scenarios and models applied	Details
<p>IEA NPS REMIND</p>	<p>In 2018-2019, The Coca-Cola Company conducted a thorough climate-related risk priority assessment, according to the framework recommended by the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and assessed Acute physical, Chronic physical and Transitional risks across a 10-year timescale.</p> <p>Two key climate-related risks were selected from this list of risks, and a qualitative and quantitative scenario analysis were conducted, using a Business As Usual (IEA NPS) and a 2 degrees scenario (REMIND). These scenarios were chosen because they contain the most relevant data points for further analysis, and their assumptions around energy demand, population growth, and carbon pricing were most relevant. Additionally, we assessed the likelihood and frequency by which these scenarios will be updated, and the comparability to other datasets. For the REMIND model, data integrity, and the choice of UNEP FI and other financial institutions to adopt this model was also considered.</p> <p>Both our assessment and scenario analysis consider a 2030 timeline (10+1 years). The scenarios have 2040 timelines, but these are extrapolated down to 2030, where appropriate. The 2030 timeline was chosen, as our current sustainability targets are set on a 2030 time horizon.</p> <p>Areas of the business considered within the scenario analysis include a wide variety of internal functions, chosen on the basis of the potential that climate change could impact their work. These include our procurement function, Sustainability function, R&D, bottling partners' operations, and technical and supply chain functions, as well as enterprise risk management, finance and insurance functions.</p> <p>The results of the scenario analyses on the 2 climate-related risks are below: (1) Extreme weather events disrupting production and limiting distribution: one-off extreme events pose significant potential impact resulting from significant off line periods or cost of activating alternative supply routes. For example, in 2017 - 2018, three major natural disasters impacted the business, within an 18-month timespan: Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Maria, and the Japanese floods. The overall estimated loss value of these events was approximately \$USD 100 million. The scenarios do not provide a quantitative indication of future trends, but both the frequency and severity of these events are expected to increase dramatically in the BAU scenario and meaningfully in the 2 degrees scenario, providing several scenarios of the future, and a qualitative picture of the potential increased exposure. As a result, in 2019, the TCCC risk function engaged a third party risk modeling expert to explore the integration of climate-related data into the modeling of the future frequency and severity of extreme weather events at our facilities across the world.</p>

	<p>The results of the scenario analysis informed the business objectives of the TCCC risk function by highlighting the company's potential exposure to climate-related impacts at our concentrate production or bottling plants, which could result in significant off-line periods and reduced supply.</p> <p>(2) GHG and/or water regulations increasing COGS (GHG) or disrupting production: The Coca-Cola system emits GHGs across the value chain, and a price on carbon would have an impact to the business, particularly on areas of the system that are energy-intensive. At the moment, our analyses indicate only mild exposure to this risk. Nonetheless, we estimate up to USD 700 million potential exposure by 2030, based on calculations using the IEA/NPS and REMIND 2 degree scenarios.</p> <p>The result of this scenario analysis directly influenced our business objective to set a Science-based target as well as our strategy of achieving this target, by demonstrating that a Science Based Target would not only mitigate a significant portion of this potential impact, but also would be in keeping with our broader climate plan, which our business has championed for many years.</p>
--	--

C3.1d

(C3.1d) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy.

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence
Products and services	Yes	<p>Packaging accounts for roughly 25 - 30% of the GHG emissions across our value chain. As such, there is a significant abatement opportunity through recycling and the use of recycled materials in our product packaging.</p> <p>In 2017, our Company prepared a waste and circular economy strategy called World Without Waste, with an official launch in January 2018. The program set goals for our business to help collect a package for every one we sell, and to move towards 50% recycled material use in all of our consumer packaging globally by 2030, a time horizon of 10+ years.</p> <p>A substantial strategic decision was to include our Scope 3 emissions in the scope of our Science Based Target at the same level of ambition as our Scope 1 and 2 emissions,</p>

		<p>based on the importance of Scope 3 packaging-related emissions to our overall GHG emissions. By aligning our circular economy goals on the use of recycled material and post-consumer collection and recycling with our Science Based Target, we help align our business priorities across two critical sustainability areas.</p> <p>Below are examples of products that have been introduced to help drive our business towards this goal: As of January 2020, local water brands in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Hong Kong, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and Uruguay are now making bottles for water brands from 100% recycled plastic. Across Western Europe Smartwater and Honest Tea bottles are now made with 100% recycled PET plastic. From the end of 2019, in Australia seven out of 10 bottles are now being made entirely from recycled plastic. The same is true for all bottles in New Zealand under 1 liter. And in multiple markets, Sprite® bottles were changed from green to clear to improve the efficiency of the recycling system.</p> <p>The Dasani brand in the United States launched a series of initiatives designed to reduce plastic waste and increase the use of recycled and renewable materials. These included a new hybrid bottle made with a mix of up to 50% plant-based and recycled PET plastic.</p>
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	<p>The ingredients used in our products account for roughly 20% of our GHG emissions and, based on our climate-related risk assessment, which was conducted on a 2030 time horizon (10+1 years), the impact of chronic physical risks limiting the availability of ingredients and raw materials in our supply chains was a key risk with the potential to impact a broad set of products and markets and our long-term growth strategies.</p> <p>We work with our suppliers to promote sustainable agricultural practices and build capabilities to meet the standards for environmental protection and responsible farm management that we require in our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP). We require our suppliers to demonstrate they are meeting the SAGP criteria by using global sustainable agriculture standards and assurance schemes. We are currently tracking SAGP compliance of 13 global priority agricultural ingredients, which represent</p>

		<p>about 80% of our total annual agricultural ingredient purchases. In 2019, 54% of these ingredient volumes were SAGP-compliant.</p> <p>A substantial strategic decision was to include our Scope 3 emissions in the scope of our Science Based Target at the same level of ambition as our Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Scope 3 agricultural ingredients account for approximately 20% of our overall GHG emissions, and by aligning our sustainable agriculture goals of SAGP compliance and sustainable sourcing with our Science Based Target, we aim to address the interdependency between these business priorities and maximize the climate-related benefits of our supply chain initiatives.</p> <p>SAGP compliance will reduce supply chain emissions and support healthy soils that will be capable of sequestering carbon. For example, a peer-reviewed study published in 2019, supported by the global partnership of WWF and The Coca-Cola Company, found that full adoption of the Bonsucro Standard across the sugarcane sector would increase yields and cut GHG emissions in half while reducing total production area by 24%. Additionally, healthy soils also hold more water, helping to prevent flooding and erosion, while also mitigating the effects of drought. The Farm Sustainability Assessment of the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform, the Bonsucro sustainable sugarcane standard and Rainforest Alliance certifications are some of the leading standards we support.</p>
Investment in R&D	Yes	<p>Emissions from refrigeration equipment account for roughly one third of the GHG emissions across our value chain. Therefore, this opportunity is assessed against a 2030 (10+1 years) time horizon, which is the target year for our SBT. Additionally, international agreements such as the Montreal Protocol and Kigali Amendment, or future regulations on carbon pricing and other climate-related regulations could influence the cost of refrigeration and improve the return of our investments in sustainable refrigeration. We continue to strive for 100% HFC-free coolers in all new purchases with 82% achieved in 2019 and an estimated investment-to-date of approximately USD 100 million on this topic. There is a significant opportunity for investment in R&D in this area, both in terms of emissions abatement as well as regulatory compliance and sustainability leadership.</p>

		<p>A substantial strategic decision was to continue to include our refrigeration equipment emissions in the scope of our GHG emissions target as we transition to a Science Based Target in 2019. More than 99% of our refrigeration emissions are Scope 3 emissions, and the decision was made to continue to include refrigeration equipment in the scope of our target, at the same level of ambition as our Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</p> <p>In our previous GHG emissions targets, we have included our cooler emissions in the scope of our GHG emissions target, and this decision has driven improvement in our cooling equipment energy efficiency by 40 percent since 2000 through various investments.</p> <p>For example, in the wake of the March 2011 Tohoku earthquake and tsunami, Japan experienced scheduled blackouts. These blackouts affected Coca-Cola’s nearly 1 million vending machines installed in the country, affecting the ability to provide cold drinks to customers. In response, Coca-Cola’s Tokyo R&D division set out to design a machine that could dispense cold drinks after being shut down for up to 16 consecutive hours. The result was the “Peak Shift” vending machine. This machine is designed to only use power for cooling at night when electricity demand is lower and electricity systems experience fewer demand issues. The machines keep drinks cold while reducing daytime energy use by 95% and consuming 10% less energy overall than an average machine. This model is now standard for new vending machines installed in Japan.</p>
Operations	Yes	<p>In our climate-related risk assessment, which was conducted on a 2030 time horizon (10+1 years), one of the identified top priority climate-related risks was the risk of GHG regulations increasing COGS. A price on carbon would have an impact to the full Coca-Cola system (the system), including bottling partners particularly in energy-intensive parts of the value chain. By 2030, we estimate an overall USD 700 million potential system exposure, based on the IEA/NPS and REMIND 2 degree scenarios. Of this impact, we expect that USD 284 million could come from impacts to manufacturing operations across our system, including our bottling partners.</p> <p>A substantial strategic decision based on these findings was</p>

		<p>to adopt a Science Based Target (SBT) for our global system, including bottling partners. We estimate that the potential future impact of carbon pricing on our manufacturing operations could be mitigated by up to 50% by achieving this target, and the primary methods of delivery are renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.</p> <p>Renewable energy and energy efficiency projects in our operations have been a core activity for sometime, driven by our legacy emissions and energy targets. Our concentrate production business has initiated nine renewable energy projects across seven plants, including in India and Pakistan, where mid-sized solar projects are active. In Pakistan, on average, the solar installation provides about 9 percent of the plant's total energy. In 2017 in India, 126,100 kilowatt hours were produced by solar, which makes up about 7 percent of the plant's total energy use and more than 10 percent of electricity consumption.</p> <p>Hindustan Coca-Cola Beverages (HCCB) announced that 14 of its 18 factories have achieved 100 per cent LED lighting, which will reduce carbon footprint, equivalent to what is achieved by 80,000 trees every year. HCCB also has two plants in Kamataka that have begun sourcing renewable electricity, sourcing up to 85% of electricity demand for these two plants from renewable sources. 3 more of its plants have, or are in the process of implementing renewable electricity for the majority of their electricity demand. Upon completion, the plant at Ameenpur will have 75 per cent of its needs met by solar power. The two other at Vijayawada and Srikalahasti, will have 50 per cent of their energy requirements met by solar energy.</p>
--	--	---

C3.1e

(C3.1e) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	Capital expenditures Capital allocation	Packaging accounts for roughly one third of the GHG emissions across our value chain. As such, there is a significant abatement opportunity through recycling and the use of recycled materials. In 2017, our Company launched a waste and circular economy strategy called World Without Waste. The program set goals for our business to help collect a

package for every one we sell, and to move towards 50% recycled material use in all of our consumer packaging globally by 2030, a time horizon of 10+ years.

A key consideration in setting these goals was the amount of GHG emissions we would be able to reduce, based on the use of recycled material and through post-consumer collection and recycling. These goals are expected to make a significant contribution to our Science Based Target, which includes Scope 3 emissions and therefore makes climate targets a critical consideration as our business delivers against our circular economy goals.

Our company has a long-range planning process with a time horizon of 3 years. Geographical business unit presidents and their functional leadership initiate the process in Q2 each year to review global and regional long range priorities over a timespan of 3 years. In Q3 , plans for the following year are made, with involvement from all functions. In parallel, a global system meeting of leadership from both The Coca-Cola Company and our bottling partners are held to review strategic initiatives. An Enterprise Risk Management forum, composed of both The Coca-Cola Company and bottling partners also assesses long term risks over this time horizon of 3 years and feeds into the overall planning process.

In 2018-2019, within this planning process, many financial decisions related to capital expenditure and allocation have been made towards the progress of our World Without Waste program and the reduction of our GHG emissions footprint, over a time horizon of 3 years. All activity related to increasing collection and recycling rates and increased usage of recycled material have a direct impact on reducing Scope 3 GHG emissions, and therefore climate-related issues directly influence these financial decisions.

There are three specific cases shared below:

(1) In October 2019, Coca-Cola joined the American Beverage Association, Keurig Dr Pepper, PepsiCo, and key non-governmental organizations to announce an industry-wide effort to reduce our use of new plastic. The “Every Bottle Back” initiative includes a \$100 million industry fund managed by Closed Loop Partners and the Recycling Partnership to help improve collection, sorting, and processing of plastic bottles into new bottles, as well as a consumer-education campaign and on-package message emphasizing the recyclability of our bottles. In addition, World Wildlife Fund will help measure and validate the industry’s progress toward reducing plastic as part of its ReSource Plastic initiative.

		<p>(2) Southeast Asia has been identified a key region for plastic leakage into the ocean, based on studies by Jenna Jambeck of the University of Georgia in 2015. In order to help improve collection rates in this region, The Coca-Cola Company was a founding investor in Circulate Capital, which was created in collaboration with Closed Loop Partners, Ocean Conservancy, and a few other like-minded companies. In 2018, The Coca-Cola Company put \$15 million in the fund, and it was an early advocate within the industry. In 2019, we continued our partnership with Circulate Capital, who has reviewed more than 200 opportunities across South and Southeast Asia and has completed its first two investments. They are providing capital for local startups and small- and medium-sized enterprises focused on ending plastic pollution.</p> <p>(3) Coca-Cola Brazil invested US\$25 million to design and create a reusable bottle with a universal design that could be utilized across multiple brands. Coca-Cola Brazil invested another US\$400 million in cleaning and refilling facilities that allow the bottles to be returned, cleaned, and refilled up to 25 times. As a result, in Brazil all 2-liter bottles across Coca-Cola, Fanta, and Sprite brands are sold in bottles that are the same color, shape, and size, which increases the efficiency of collection, cleaning, and filling. The reusable bottles are replacing 200 million nonrefillable bottles each year, and they have contributed to the strongest performance of Coca-Cola Brazil in 7 years, in which the business grew more than twice the rate of consumer spending.</p>
--	--	--

C3.1f

(C3.1f) Provide any additional information on how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy and financial planning (optional).

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

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

Both absolute and intensity targets

C4.1a

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

Target reference number

Abs 1

Year target was set

2019

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

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

Base year

2015

Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO₂e)

70,144,410

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

100

Target year

2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

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

52,608,307.5

Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

52,608,307.5

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

100

Target status in reporting year

New

Is this a science-based target?

Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative

Please explain (including target coverage)

We continue to evaluate and make changes in our operations and throughout the Coca-Cola system value chain to reduce our climate impact. This target is a Coca-Cola System level target, including The Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners. The target brings our diverse sustainability initiatives under one goal to reduce the carbon

footprint across the Coca-Cola system's full value chain by 25% by 2030, in absolute terms. Progress toward reducing the greenhouse gas emissions across our manufacturing processes, packaging formats, delivery fleet, refrigeration equipment and ingredient sourcing has been measured under an intensity target (target Int 1) from 2010 to 2020. This target, recently made public in 2019, is a Science-Based Target, and an absolute reduction target in line with a well-below 2C global average temperature rise scenario. Due to the nature of our franchise bottling system, in this CDP response, our manufacturing emissions are normally split between Scopes 1 and 2 for company-owned facilities and Scope 3 for bottling partner facilities. However, in our "drink in your hand" (intensity target) calculations, as well as this absolute reduction target, we consider the full Coca-Cola system (including franchise bottling partners) in the calculation of our manufacturing, distribution and refrigeration emissions.

C4.1b

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

Target reference number

Int 1

Year target was set

2013

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

Scope 1+2 (market-based) + 3 (upstream and downstream)

Intensity metric

Other, please specify

Grams CO₂e per liter of beverage sold

Base year

2010

Intensity figure in base year (metric tons CO₂e per unit of activity)

452

% of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category) covered by this intensity figure

100

Target year

2020

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

Intensity figure in target year (metric tons CO₂e per unit of activity) [auto-calculated]

339

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

-7

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-10

Intensity figure in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e per unit of activity)

345

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

94.6902654867

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

Please explain (including target coverage)

We continue to evaluate and make changes in our operations and throughout the Coca-Cola system value chain to reduce our climate impact. This target is a Coca-Cola System level target, including The Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners. The target brings our diverse sustainability initiatives under one goal to reduce the carbon footprint of the "drink in your hand" by 25 percent by 2020. Progress toward reducing the greenhouse gas emissions across our manufacturing processes, packaging formats, delivery fleet, refrigeration equipment and ingredient sourcing is now being measured toward the "drink in your hand" goal.

The calculation of progress toward our "drink in your hand" goal has been internally vetted using accepted and relevant scientific and technical methodologies, which are aligned with GHG Protocol scopes 1, 2 and 3. Due to the nature of our franchise bottling system, in this CDP response, our manufacturing emissions are normally split between Scopes 1 and 2 for company-owned facilities and Scope 3 for bottling partner facilities. However, in our "drink in your hand" calculations, we consider the full Coca-Cola system (including franchise bottling partners) in the calculation of our manufacturing, distribution and refrigeration emissions.

C4.2

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

No other climate-related targets

C4.3

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

Yes

C4.3a

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	1	120
To be implemented*	3	13,086.51
Implementation commenced*	0	0
Implemented*	26	21,170
Not to be implemented	0	0

C4.3b

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

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

169

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

56,107

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

4,000

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Steam leak repairs at Eswatini.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

92

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

30,492

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

10,000

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Insulation of steam lines at Eswatini.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

4

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

1,287

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

15,000

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Chiller system improvements at Eswatini.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Compressed air

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

9

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

2,891

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

15,000

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Compressed air system improvements at Eswatini.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

100

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

33,265

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

15,000

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Boiler system improvements at Eswatini.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity
Product/component/material recycling

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

7,396

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

0

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Spent carbon and sludge from wastewater treatment sent for recycling in India.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Motors and drives

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

125

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

32,861

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

56,956

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Plant water pump upgrades in Ballina,, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Motors and drives

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

25

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

6,641

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

10,967

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

VSD on CHW plant oil cooling pumps. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Combined heat and power (cogeneration)

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

29

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

7,590

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

14,168

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

CP optimizer on CHW plant. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

116

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

30,359

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

46,811

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Flavor booster refrigeration demand met by a dedicated small local split system. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Motors and drives

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

54

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

14,231

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

42,180

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Supply and installation of VSDs on chilled water condensers. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
Lighting

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

141

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

36,913

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

136,800

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Installation of LEDs lighting in staging areas. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Motors and drives

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

155

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

40,631

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

53,674

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Installation of VSD pumps for ASRS glycol system.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

50

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

64,331

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

124,708

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Upgrade of gas burner. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

240

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

62,852

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

53,674

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Frozen ROCC room was previously inefficient, updated to trace cooling instead and switch off. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

246

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

64,439

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Avoidance of cooling requirements by using ambient temperatures. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

90

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

23,718

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Pekasol charge and pressure reduction. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

59

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

15,595

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Reduced suction temperature. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Compressed air

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

89

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

23,243

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Discharge on compressor set point optimized. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Transportation
Other, please specify
Container load consolidation

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

882

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

28,500

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

0

Payback period

No payback

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Less than Container Load (LCL) consolidation in Europe. Ballina, Ireland.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Transportation

Other, please specify

Utilize rail service

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1,464

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

0

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

0

Payback period

No payback

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Ongoing

Comment

Ballina to Dublin Rail Service.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

Solid biofuels

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

3,000

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

26,000

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

133,315

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

Chennai Plant. Briquette (biomass) boiler installation.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

250

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

9,750

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

26,000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

6-10 years

Comment

Plant lighting replacement with energy efficient lighting in 13 nos. plant.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

Solar PV

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

850

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

9,555

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

45,500

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

21-30 years

Comment

Sanand Plant - Solar rooftop installation.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

Wind

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

4,100

Scope(s)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

4,875

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Wind PPA Goblej Plant.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

Wave

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1,435

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

2,048

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

3-5 years

Comment

Additional Wind PPA at Goblej Plant.

C4.3c

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

Method	Comment
Internal incentives/recognition programs	The Coca-Cola Company collaborated with WWF (World Wildlife Fund) to develop a Top 10 Energy Efficiency practices program for our plants to implement. By the end of 2017, 801 plants had registered in the Top 10 program, and 1/3 of the plants had completed the energy efficiency top 10 challenge, entitling them to public recognition for the plants and/or

	<p>organizations that successfully completed all practices, helping bottlers yield reputation value from their environmental work. Additionally, more than 50% of the plants have implemented 7 out of 10 energy efficiency measures.</p> <p>Implementing the top 10 projects at all plants will contribute toward our 2020 value-chain carbon target to reduce the emissions from “the drink in your hand” by 25%.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>TCCC and its bottling partners have internal governance structures to facilitate communication and strategy, share best-practice, and recognize achievements within our bottling operations across the globe. There are monthly conference calls to convene relevant staff globally on energy efficiency, energy reduction, and renewable energy projects facilitated by our global technical team, which convenes monthly and annually in-person to share best practice and recognize achievements, as well as formulate strategies on progressing emissions reduction and energy reduction on a monthly basis. In 2016, a clean energy assessment, conducted through this governance structure, provided strategic, locally-relevant insights into drivers and barriers to clean energy investments at our bottling partners, allowing the Company to build insights on clean energy, as well as develop a toolbox to provide Business Units and bottling partners with financial and technical assessment capabilities on clean energy investments to develop locally-relevant strategies. Additionally, an energy risk assessment framework and model has been developed through the collaborative governance structure, which allows insight into local and regional energy risks and investment opportunities, which are then aggregated and fed into business strategy.</p> <p>Commercial Products Supply (CPS), the concentrate and beverage-base arm of Coca-Cola, has initiated nine renewable energy projects across seven plants, including in India and Pakistan, where mid-sized solar projects are active. In Pakistan, on average, the solar installation provides about 9 percent of the plant’s total energy. In 2017 in India, 126,100 kilowatt hours were produced by solar, which makes up about 7 percent of the plant’s total energy use and more than 10 percent of electricity consumption. This will almost double when the additional solar panels begin producing in the second phase of the project. The feasibility of larger-scale projects are currently under examination by the team.</p> <p>Several of our bottling partners have their own renewable energy commitments. While these partners are not owned by the Company, their efforts are captured under the manufacturing pillar of our “drink in your hand” goal, and are critical in helping deliver results as a system.</p>

C4.5

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

Yes

C4.5a

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

Level of aggregation

Group of products

Description of product/Group of products

PlantBottle packaging is a type of PET plastic that looks, functions and recycles like traditional PET plastic, but does so with a lighter carbon footprint. It is partially made from renewable biomass instead of petrochemicals. Because the carbon in the renewable biomass is derived from carbon dioxide that is removed from the atmosphere, customers that sell our products packaged in PlantBottle packaging are avoiding emissions from packaging that otherwise is manufactured with non-renewable petroleum-based PET.

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

Low-carbon product and avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify

Internal Lifecycle Assessment (LCA), peer-reviewed and conducted in partnership with multiple external stakeholders and LCA experts.

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

4

Comment

Since the program has been introduced, Plantbottle has been sold in over 40 markets and in 35 brands. For commercial reasons, we are unable to disclose % revenue of products using this low carbon product.

Level of aggregation

Company-wide

Description of product/Group of products

Use of recycled PET in our packaging uses significantly less carbon than virgin PET. In 2017, we set a target to move towards including an average of 50% recycled PET globally in all of our primary packaging by 2030. We are working hard to make progress against this target.

In Mexico, our bottled water brand, Ciel, is now available in a 100% rPET bottle, which builds on the extremely strong collection and conversion infrastructure that our system has financed over the past decade. In Australia, our Mount Franklin water brand is also now available in 100% rPET. Each of these is a brand with significant volume, and there are many more plans in the pipeline with roll out scheduled in 2019.

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

Low-carbon product and avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify

Internal Lifecycle Assessment (LCA), conducted in partnership with external stakeholders and LCA experts.

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

5

Comment

Level of aggregation

Product

Description of product/Group of products

Coca-Cola Freestyle machines are fountain-like beverage dispensing machines that allow users to select from a large variety of beverages. The machines mix the beverages at the time of order, and dispense them into cups, reducing emissions associated with packaging, as well as plastic waste. We continue to expand this “package-less” delivery model for beverages to more than 50,000 machines serving 14 million drinks daily, with continued expansion into Europe and Latin America. Based on a 2013 LCA study we estimate that every 1,000 L sold via our Freestyle machines saves the environment 110 Kg of CO₂ emissions.

More recently, we introduced DASANI PureFill 2.0, an innovative packageless dispensing platform that leverages the technology in Coca-Cola Freestyle to provide chilled, filtered DASANI water with customizable flavor options. In 2020, PureFill will expand with the placement of 250 dispensers across the United States. In 2018, we launched the first Bonaqua Water Station in Hong Kong, and subsequently rolled out 84 more across the region in 2019. The stations allow customers to fill their own cups with Bonaqua’s assortment of flavored waters and are being made available in a variety of

locations including retail, work, and sports and entertainment venues. Another 404 stations are scheduled to be installed in 2020.

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

Avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify

Internal Lifecycle Assessment (LCA), conducted in partnership with external stakeholders and LCA experts.

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

11

Comment

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

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

Scope 1

Base year start

January 1, 2004

Base year end

December 31, 2004

Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

573,143

Comment

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2004

Base year end

December 31, 2004

Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

885,145

Comment

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2004

Base year end

December 31, 2004

Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

885,145

Comment

C5.2

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

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

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

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

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

687,597

Comment

C6.2

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

Row 1

Scope 2, location-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

Scope 2, market-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

Comment

C6.3

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

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based

868,343

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)

871,304

Comment

C6.4

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

Yes

C6.4a

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

Source

Direct emissions from stationary fuel consumption for warehouses and offices

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

No emissions excluded

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

No emissions excluded

Explain why this source is excluded

Under materiality threshold.

Source

Indirect emissions from warehouses and offices due to use of electricity/heat/steam

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

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

Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded

Under materiality threshold.

C6.5

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

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

22,809,959

Emissions calculation methodology

Our calculations include key packaging and ingredient materials, including PET bottles, closures, and labels, aluminum and steel cans and can-ends, as well as glass bottles and crowns, sweeteners (including sugar), Carbon dioxide for carbonation, and other key agricultural ingredients. Volumes of each item are collected from our operations and bottling partners across the globe, and a global average emissions factor for each material is applied to calculate emissions. For packaging, the end-of-life impact is included, using a 50:50 allocation methodology between usage of recycled material and rates of recovery. The methodology is vetted internally and applied according to accepted international standards such as the GHG protocol. In addition, the data received from our bottling partners is reviewed internally for errors, and emissions factors are selected based on criteria such as source credibility or adherence to internationally and scientifically accepted methodologies. However, neither the data nor the methodology behind this calculation have been verified externally.

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

100

Please explain

As part of our efforts to refine the methodology for tracking against our commitment to reduce the carbon footprint of the “drink in your hand” by 25%, we are working to simplify our data collection and measuring systems as well as preparing data and processes for calculating our progress against this target to be ready for independent third party verification.

Capital goods

Evaluation status

Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

1,799,000

Emissions calculation methodology

The emissions value for Capital Goods is a combined figure of our estimates of emissions from production of our manufacturing and operations equipment, as well as from the production of our cold drinks and immediate consumption equipment. For manufacturing and operations equipment, 10 % of the total manufacturing GWP (including equipment, electricity and fuels, all scopes) was attributed to the equipment. This number was chosen based on interviews with experts on LCAs for the beverage sector, as well as through a literature scan on best practice. For Cold drinks and immediate consumption equipment, Biointelligence Service Preparatory Studies for Eco-design, Commercial refrigerators and freezers, 2007, provides GWP data for production, use and waste phases for coolers and vendors. This data was divided by the lifetime of the equipment for annual estimates. Ecodesign for Commercial Refrigeration, JRC science and policy report Preparatory study update Final report, 2014 suggests 8-10 years as equipment lifetime. Based on numerous considerations, the lifetime of CDE equipment was adjusted to 10 years. The annual emissions data for production was then multiplied by the number of coolers and vendor units for emissions estimates. For fountains, an average ratio of production emissions over emissions from electricity consumption was applied to the actual electricity consumption of fountain equipment.

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

100

Please explain

The emissions value for Capital Goods is a combined figure of our estimates of emissions from production of our manufacturing and operations equipment, as well as from the production of our cold drinks and immediate consumption equipment. Our cold drinks and immediate consumption equipment include not only those owned by The Coca-Cola Company, but also by our independent bottling partners. In our materiality analysis, emissions from capital goods in our manufacturing and operations were estimated to be 671,000 tonnesCO₂e, and emissions from capital goods in the total Coca-Cola system’s cold drinks and immediate consumption equipment was estimated to be 1,128,000 tonnes CO₂e. The sum of these two numbers, as well as the individual

values were all under our materiality threshold and this item is therefore considered not relevant.

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

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

According to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance, this item is not applicable. Emissions relevant to our System generated within our value chain are reported within other Scope 3 items, and the energy consumption of our immediate consumption equipment, or cold drinks refrigeration equipment across The Coca-Cola system is captured within "Processing of sold products."

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

This item is included in the emissions factors we apply to calculate emissions of our packaging and ingredient raw materials. The screening of the emissions factors applied to our packaging and ingredients reported in Purchased Goods and Services include an assessment of the system boundaries defined in the LCA's which form the basis of the factors. We define, where possible according to data availability, system boundaries which include the transportation and distribution of materials upstream of our operations.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status

Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

0

Emissions calculation methodology

Volume of waste generated at bottling facilities was split into volume recycled, volume landfilled and all others (including volume of waste that is recovered but not recycled). These were multiplied by a material-specific global average emissions factors for recycling, and land filling, respectively, sourced from a proprietary third-party expert database. Volume categorized under all other was considered to have no net impact.

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

100

Please explain

The actual value for this response is a negative value. However, the ORS does not allow for negative values. The credits from recycling outweigh the impact of landfilling

which results in a negative GWP figure. However, the figure is below the materiality threshold and is therefore considered not relevant.

Business travel

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

130,838

Emissions calculation methodology

Kilometers are calculated from travel agency records and emissions factors are applied against three categories of flight distances: short, medium and long-haul, as well as in each class of travel, ranging from economy to first. When the flight class is unspecified the average GHG emission factor is applied. The relevant travel agencies provide the records to a third-party data aggregator that provides the total air miles flown to TCCC.

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

100

Please explain

Business travel emissions are calculated by a third party based on guidelines specified by the UK Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), from corporate travel based on air miles flown. Business Travel emissions are reported based on information provided by our primary global travel agents to a third party data aggregator. Travel booked outside of our primary agents (i.e. booked using websites or local travel agents) are not included. TCCC determines this to be immaterial due to the fact that it is not allowed by the TCCC Travel & Expense Policy.

Employee commuting

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

At current, The Coca-Cola Company will report business travel emissions, though not employee commuting, as emissions for commuting for The Coca-Cola Company employees as a proportion of total emissions, are not deemed significant.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

To the best of our knowledge, this item is not applicable to emissions calculations of The Coca-Cola Company, according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

2,290,854

Emissions calculation methodology

Data collected via internal TCCC collection system, Stewardship Data Warehouse. Utilized GHG Protocol established methods and factors from IPCC. Includes total System fleet emissions minus The Coca-Cola Company fleet emissions.

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

55

Please explain

Fleet emissions from indirect operations result from the combustion of fuels in distribution vehicles not owned by the company, and within the operational control of our bottling partners. The methodology for calculating emissions from this source is identical to "Scope 1: Fleet."

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

22,630,377

Emissions calculation methodology

TCCC recognizes a default refrigerant annual loss rate of 1.5 percent of charge. TCCS cold drink equipment (coolers, vending machines and fountain dispensers) throughout its sales territories range from Countertop, 1 Door (100-300L), 1 Door (>300L), 2 Doors, 3 Doors, 4 Doors, Chest (Reach In), Open (Air Curtain), Open Top, and Specialty. Refrigerants include CFC, HFC, HCFC, CO₂. The size of vending machines can vary from a 0-300 can machine, 300-500 cans, 500+ cans, and others. The breakdown of the refrigerant type used within our fleet of coolers assumed in our calculations is based on 2010 data. Given our progress in introducing HFC-free and CO₂ equipment, this breakdown may have changed. The cold drink equipment inventory is estimated through internal processes administered by Corporate departments including Commercial Leadership, Marketing and Finance. The commercial data used for units of cold drink equipment are requested quarterly from our bottling system for the top markets. Of those that respond, results account for approximately 85% of total sales volume. The remaining 15% is reported under a "Rest of World" total. The data also includes a breakdown of the equipment type, and the proportion of system cold drink equipment that is owned by TCCC is estimated using facility production volume from the reporting year.

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

100

Please explain

Immediate consumption equipment is surveyed regularly from the Coca-Cola system. Survey was last conducted in 2011 covering 2010 data, and separated The Coca-Cola Company from the Bottler-owned equipment. This value represents all emissions associated with Bottler-owned equipment, including electricity consumption and refrigerant losses, as well as emissions associated with electricity consumption for equipment owned by The Coca-Cola Company. The breakdown of the refrigerant type used within our fleet of coolers assumed in our calculations is based on 2010 data. Given our progress in introducing HFC-free and CO₂ equipment, this breakdown may have changed.

Use of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Emissions from the usage of our cold drink equipment, both Company-owned and bottler-owned are reported under Processing of sold products, rather than under Use of Sold Products. To the best of our knowledge, and according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance, there are no further emissions, which require evaluation under this item.

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Emissions from End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products are included in the calculation methodology of packaging under Purchased Goods and Services. To the best of our knowledge, and according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance, there are no further emissions, which require evaluation under this item.

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

To the best of our knowledge, this item is not applicable to emissions calculations of The Coca-Cola Company, according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance.

Franchises

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

4,378,013

Emissions calculation methodology

Data collected via internal TCCC collection system, Stewardship Data Warehouse. Utilized GHG Protocol established methods and factors from IPCC. Includes total manufacturing Scope 1 + 2 Coca-Cola System emissions minus The Coca-Cola Company Scope 1 + 2 emissions.

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

97

Please explain

Manufacturing emissions from indirect operations arise from activities that emit GHGs from the combustion of fuels at bottling partner facilities. The methodology and emission factors for calculating emissions from this source follows GHG Protocol guidance, and is identical to the methodology applied to the Manufacturing emissions reported within Scope 1 and 2.

Investments

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

To the best of our knowledge, this item is not applicable to emissions calculations of The Coca-Cola Company, according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance.

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

To the best of our knowledge, this item is not applicable to emissions calculations of The Coca-Cola Company, according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance.

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

To the best of our knowledge, this item is not applicable to emissions calculations of The Coca-Cola Company, according to the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Guidance.

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

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

Yes

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

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

Activity

Agriculture/Forestry

Scope 3 category

Purchased goods and services

Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

12,503,079

Please explain

This value represents the total emissions associated with all product ingredients included in our emissions calculations. This value therefore includes sweeteners, fruits, and other agricultural ingredients. The number is calculated by multiplying the total volume of each ingredient with its appropriate factor of GHG emissions per unit of ingredient associated with the growing and processing of each ingredient.

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

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

No

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

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

Agricultural commodities

Sugar

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

Nutritive Sweetener volumes (sugar and HFCS) are collected from our operations and bottling partners across the globe, and a global average emissions factor for each type of sugar or nutritive sweetener is applied to calculate emissions. The methodology is vetted internally and applied according to accepted international standards such as the GHG protocol. In addition, the data received from our bottling partners is reviewed internally for errors, and emissions factors are selected based on criteria such as source credibility or adherence to internationally and scientifically accepted methodologies. However, neither the data nor the methodology behind this calculation have been verified externally.

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

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

Sugar

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

7,002,116

Change from last reporting year

Lower

Please explain

Our calculations for sugar are based on consumption volumes from our operations and bottling partners across the globe, and a global average emissions factor applied to calculate emissions. The methodology is vetted internally and applied according to accepted international standards such as the GHG protocol. In addition, the data received from our bottling partners is reviewed internally for errors, and emissions factors are selected based on criteria such as source credibility or adherence to internationally and scientifically accepted methodologies. However, neither the data nor the methodology behind this calculation have been verified externally.

C6.10

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

Intensity figure

0.00004183

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

1,558,901

Metric denominator

unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total

37,266,000,000

Scope 2 figure used

Market-based

% change from previous year

10

Direction of change

Decreased

Reason for change

The 10% decrease is due in part to a number of emissions reduction initiatives that have taken place across our global business. For example, during 2019, Hindustan Coca-Cola Bottling, the Coca-Cola Company's bottling entity in India, embarked on a unique circular waste initiative of using spent carbon and effluent treatment plant sludge. Cement plants in India use huge quantities of sub-bituminous coal as a source of heat and HCCB saw the synergy of sending waste spent carbon and sludge to replace coal. By sending a total of 9,150 MT of spent carbon and sludge for coprocessing at cement plants, they helped avoid 4256 tonnes of coal and mitigated 7396 tonnes of CO₂e emissions.

Another, more salient reason for the decrease is increased revenue vs. 2018.

Intensity figure

18.08

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

1,558,901

Metric denominator

full time equivalent (FTE) employee

Metric denominator: Unit total

86,200

Scope 2 figure used

Market-based

% change from previous year

23

Direction of change

Decreased

Reason for change

The 23% decrease is due in part a number of emissions reduction initiatives that have taken place across our global business. For example, during 2019, Hindustan Coca-Cola Bottling, the Coca-Cola Company's bottling entity in India, embarked on a unique circular waste initiative of using spent carbon and effluent treatment plant sludge. Cement plants in India use huge quantities of sub-bituminous coal as a source of heat and HCCB saw the synergy of sending waste spent carbon and sludge to replace coal. By sending a total of 9,150 MT of spent carbon and sludge for coprocessing at cement plants, they helped avoid 4256 tonnes of coal and mitigated 7396 tonnes of CO₂e emissions.

Another, more salient reason for the decrease is a significant increase in headcount vs. 2018.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

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

Yes

C7.1a

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO ₂ e)	GWP Reference
Other, please specify HFC-134a	14,563	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other, please specify HCFC-22	2,281	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
CO ₂	670,753	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

C7.2

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e)
Argentina	143
Bangladesh	2,624
Brazil	387
Cambodia	12,801
Canada	7,560
Chile	125
China	1,469
Comoros	2,174
Costa Rica	152
Egypt	174
Ethiopia	15,285
France	1,895
Ghana	18,614
India	95,311
Indonesia	17
Ireland	12,612
Japan	593
Kenya	30,878
Malaysia	2,334
Mayotte	7,612
Mexico	0
Mozambique	5,909
Myanmar	18,027
Namibia	1,460
Nepal	6,657
Pakistan	72
Philippines	46,441
Puerto Rico	1,343
Republic of Korea	52
Singapore	0
South Africa	85,710

Sri Lanka	510
Eswatini	817
Turkey	611
Uganda	28,371
United Republic of Tanzania	18,384
United States of America	223,828
Viet Nam	22,337
Other, please specify Corporate Aircraft	8,158
Other, please specify Rest of World - Refrigerants	2,568
Zambia	3,533
Botswana	50

C7.3

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

By business division

By activity

C7.3a

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

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO ₂ e)
Commercial Product Supply	18,526
Bottler Investments Group	152,668
Coca-Cola North America	101,483
Syrup	39,842
TCCC	854
Immediate Consumption Equipment	16,844
International Airspace - Corporate Aircraft	8,158
Fleet (Distribution)	349,222

C7.3c

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e)
Manufacturing	313,373

Fleet (distribution)	349,222
International Airspace - Corporate Aircraft	8,158
Immediate Consumption Equipment	16,844

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

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

Yes

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

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

Activity

Processing/Manufacturing

Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

313,373

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

Scope 1 emissions include emissions associated with manufacturing, corporate aircraft and immediate consumption equipment losses. Direct emissions from stationary fuel consumption at warehouses, distribution centers and offices, CO₂ loss during production and AC/Chiller emissions are excluded from the reported Scope 1 emissions.

Manufacturing emissions from direct operations arise from TCCC-owned/controlled activities that emit GHGs from the combustion of fuels. TCCC currently tracks the following fuels: light fuel oil (LFO, diesel, distillate fuel oil), heavy fuel oil (HFO, residual fuel oil), kerosene, propane (LPG), natural gas, coal, landfill gas, biofuels, biomass, wastewater treatment plant gas, and other fuel sources specified by the facility.

CO₂ loss during production is derived from the CO₂ purchased as an ingredient for our products. Therefore, this item is captured in Scope 3, Purchased Goods & Services, which includes the full volume of our purchased CO₂ in 2018.

Emissions Factors: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006)

- Emissions from standalone (i.e., not co-located) warehouses, distribution centers, and

offices (based on emissions being lower than threshold of five percent of total Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions)

Activity

Distribution

Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

349,222

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

Direct emissions from stationary fuel consumption at warehouses, distribution centers and offices, CO₂ loss during production and AC/Chiller emissions are excluded from the reported Scope 1 emissions.

Fleet emissions from direct operations result from the combustion of fuels in company-owned and company leased distribution vehicles. Fuel use by the distribution fleet is determined from purchasing data collected. Fleet fuel data is collected by fuel type and then converted into diesel equivalents, from which emissions are calculated. Where data is unavailable or incomplete, average emissions intensities (grams CO₂ per liter produced/delivered) and sales volume for the organizational unit are used to extrapolate emissions for the distribution fleets.

TCCC recognizes a default refrigerant annual loss rate of 1.5 percent of charge. TCCS cold drink equipment (coolers, vending machines and fountain dispensers) throughout its sales territories range from Countertop, 1 Door (100-300L), 1 Door (>300L), 2 Doors, 3 Doors, 4 Doors, Chest (Reach In), Open (Air Curtain), Open Top, and Specialty. Refrigerants include CFC, HFC, HCFC, CO₂. The size of vending machines can vary from a 0-300 can machine, 300-500 cans, 500+ cans, and others. The breakdown of the refrigerant type used within our fleet of coolers assumed in our calculations is based on 2010 data. Given our progress in introducing HFC-free and CO₂ equipment, this breakdown may have changed.

The cold drink equipment inventory is estimated through internal processes administered by Corporate departments including Commercial Leadership, Marketing and Finance. The commercial data used for units of cold drink equipment are requested quarterly from our bottling system for the top markets. Of the those that respond, results account for approximately 85% of total sales volume. The remaining 15% is reported under a "Rest of World" total. The data also includes a breakdown of the equipment type, and the proportion of system cold drink equipment that is owned by TCCC is estimated using facility production volume from the reporting year.

Emissions Factors:

Fleet - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006)

Immediate Consumption Equipment Refrigerant Loss -

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2006 "Fourth Assessment Report" (GWP100 years)

C7.5

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in Scope 2 market-based approach (MWh)
Argentina	1,290	1,290	3,253	0
Bangladesh	5,851	5,849	10,268	15
Brazil	1,023	1,023	7,767	0
Cambodia	6,683	6,680	10,002	3,147
Canada	1,035	1,035	6,452	0
Chile	898	897	1,826	0
China	4,948	4,946	7,033	0
Comoros	52	52	155	0
Costa Rica	5	5	1,913	0
Egypt	1,355	1,355	2,715	0
Ethiopia	3	3	10,075	0
France	749	577	9,605	0
Ghana	2,383	2,382	8,498	0
India	177,494	177,416	218,778	471
Indonesia	595	595	686	0
Ireland	5,079	8,591	11,879	0
Japan	1,583	1,583	2,683	0
Kenya	5,893	5,890	27,665	0
Malaysia	31,415	31,401	42,778	0
Mayotte	464	464	1,387	0
Mexico	2,082	2,081	3,861	0
Mozambique	1,025	1,025	12,980	0
Myanmar	8,212	8,208	20,179	0

Namibia	562	562	9,140	0
Nepal	0	0	7,532	0
Pakistan	256	256	544	82
Philippines	179,547	179,467	237,619	0
Puerto Rico	3,933	3,931	13,014	0
Republic of Korea	373	373	614	0
Singapore	3,418	3,416	7,658	0
South Africa	162,580	162,508	151,480	1,620
Sri Lanka	5,723	5,721	7,324	735
Eswatini	1,346	1,345	4,022	0
Turkey	826	826	1,586	0
Uganda	7,796	7,793	22,288	0
United Republic of Tanzania	4,291	4,289	12,534	0
United States of America	211,209	211,115	443,942	0
Viet Nam	20,688	20,679	62,621	0
Zambia	455	455	4,832	0
Botswana	5,223	5,221	3,260	0

C7.6

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

By business division

By activity

C7.6a

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

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO ₂ e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO ₂ e)
Commercial Product Supply	28,203	31,163
Bottler Investment Group	613,566	613,566
Coca-Cola North America	188,272	188,273
Syrup	36,521	36,521

TCCC	1,781	1,781
------	-------	-------

C7.6c

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

Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Manufacturing	868,343	871,304

C7.9

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

Increased

C7.9a

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

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption	0	No change	0	There was little change in our emissions in 2019 due to renewable energy consumption.
Other emissions reduction activities	21,170	Decreased	1	Total of emission reduction activities outlined in C4.3a and C4.3b. Based on the total emissions reported for Scope 1 and 2 in 2018 of 1,472,655 MT CO2e and the total reported emission reduction activities of 21,170 MT CO2e, the percentage change in emissions due to emissions reduction activities is: $(-21,170/1,472,655) * 100 = -1\%$. This represents a 1% decrease in emissions due to emissions reduction activities.
Divestment	37,311	Decreased	3	The total emissions from divested facilities is 37,311 MT CO2e. The percentage change in emissions due to divestment is: $(-37,311/1,472,655)*100 = -$

				3%. This represents a 3% reduction in emissions due to divestment.
Acquisitions	54,541	Increased	4	The total emissions from newly acquired facilities is 18,578 MT CO ₂ e. The percentage change in emissions due to acquisitions is $(54,541/1,472,655)*100 = 4\%$. This represents a 4% increase in emissions due to acquisitions.
Mergers	0	No change	0	
Change in output	93,366	Increased	6	The change in production for company owned facilities excluding facilities that were acquired or divested was 6.34%. The total emissions associated with the change in output was $6.34*1,472,655/100 = 93,366$.
Change in methodology	0	No change	0	
Change in boundary	0	No change	0	
Change in physical operating conditions	0	No change	0	
Unidentified	3,181	Decreased	0	The change in emissions from 2018 to 2019 was 86,246 MT CO ₂ e. Taking into account the emissions associated with emission reduction activities, divestments, acquisitions, and change in output, there is a net reduction in emissions of 3,181 MT CO ₂ e that is unidentified. $(86,346 + 21,170 + 37,311 - 54,541 - 93,366) = -3,181$. The percent change in emissions that is unidentified is $(-3,181/1,472,655)*100 = 0\%$
Other	0	No change	0	

C7.9b

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

Market-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

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

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

C8.2

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

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

C8.2a

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

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	HHV (higher heating value)	159,617	1,291,511	1,451,128
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity		67,480	1,331,395	1,398,875

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam		0	12,733	12,733
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy		6,070		6,070
Total energy consumption		233,168	2,635,639	2,868,807

C8.2b

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

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

C8.2c

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

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Light Fuel Oil

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

239,640

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

70.4

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Heavy Fuel Oil

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

173,681

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

73.5

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Kerosene

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

68.27

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Natural Gas

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

791,593

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

50.49

Unit

kg CO₂ per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Coal

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

45,150

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

89.93

Unit

kg CO₂ per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Biofuels

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

159,617

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

0

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Propane Liquid

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

41,443

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

0

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

GHG Protocol GCV (HHV)

Comment

C8.2d

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

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	6,070	6,070	6,070	6,070
Heat	0	0	0	0
Steam	0	0	0	0
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2e

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

Sourcing method

Other, please specify
On-Site Solar Generation

Low-carbon technology type

Solar

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

Other, please specify
South Africa, India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Pakistan

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

6,070

Comment

On-site solar generation

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

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

C10. Verification

C10.1

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

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

C10.1a

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

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process


Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 19 - CDP IL203 Ltr of Rep-Review_Final.pdf

Page/ section reference

Page 1

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

49

C10.1b

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

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process


Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 19 - CDP IL203 Ltr of Rep-Review_Final.pdf

Page/ section reference

Page 1

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.1c

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

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Franchises

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process


Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 19 - CDP IL203 Ltr of Rep-Review_Final.pdf

Page/section reference

Page 1

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Business travel

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process


Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 19 - CDP IL203 Ltr of Rep-Review_Final.pdf

Page/section reference

Page 1

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.2

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

No, but we are actively considering verifying within the next two years

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

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

Yes

C11.1a

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

South Africa carbon tax

C11.1c

(C11.1c) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

South Africa carbon tax

Period start date

January 1, 2019

Period end date

December 31, 2019

% of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

100

Total cost of tax paid

57,574

Comment

The total cost of tax paid in 2019 is expressed in USD. The actual amount accrued / paid in 2019 in ZAR is 970,421. This is the amount accrued / paid, AFTER applying a 60% allowance as per the legal requirements.

C11.1d

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

In South Africa, effective June 2019, the government has implemented a carbon tax, which will impact the food and beverage sector.

Our strategy for complying with this carbon tax is to assess exposure and mitigate impact through efficiency and investments in electrification and renewable energy. Our exposures to this tax are from fuel usage and process and fugitive emissions at our bottling facilities located in South Africa, which is primarily generated through fuel inputs to thermal heating and on-site electrical generation equipment, as well as natural gas / LNG vehicles such as forklifts. While our current exposure is limited, there is expectation that tax rates will increase in the future, and our strategy is to anticipate and avoid these costs by increasing the energy efficiency of our existing equipment, and to invest in solar generation and electric forklifts, powered by photovoltaic solar cells.

As a case study, Coca-Cola Beverages South Africa (CCBSA), has announced its intention to have 25% of its electricity powered by renewable sources by 2025. The first 10% of this capacity, about 18-million kwh/year, was rolled out across 11 of our sites through rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) units, with combined installed capacity of 10.6 MW. More specifically, in our Bloemfontein plant, in which these photovoltaic units have been installed, local teams are also exploring with suppliers to replace gas-powered forklifts with electric forklifts, which would be linked to solar PV stations. The solar PV generation systems at CCBSA's plants will assist in decreasing the use of coal by South African thermal electricity generation power plants by about five-million tonnes a year and carbon emissions by 14 000 t/y.

C11.2

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

No

C11.3

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

No, but we anticipate doing so in the next two years

C12. Engagement

C12.1

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

Yes, our suppliers

Yes, our customers

C12.1a

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

Type of engagement

Information collection (understanding supplier behavior)

Details of engagement

Collect climate change and carbon information at least annually from suppliers

% of suppliers by number

10

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

70

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

70

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Between 45 and 55% of our carbon footprint across our value chain is with our ingredients and packaging that we purchase (Scope 3 purchased goods and services). It is therefore essential that we collect climate change and carbon information from suppliers of these commodities in order to inform our supplier evaluation process and decision-making, and discussions with suppliers on carbon reduction initiatives and targets. Our collection of supplier carbon data is focused primarily on suppliers of aluminum, sugar, PET plastic and glass as these commodities have the largest impact on our supply chain carbon footprint.

In 2019 we requested that 150 of our most critical suppliers complete CDP's climate change questionnaire and specific supplier survey. This helps us to understand their current state of activity in GHG emissions reduction, such as target-setting, use of renewable energy and energy efficiency activities. We analyze supplier responses, and share this information with our procurement team who, along with a range of other sustainability metrics, use the data to score and benchmark suppliers on their sustainability performance. The sustainability performance of suppliers is then combined with other data points, and is used to inform discussions with suppliers, as well as

sourcing decisions by our procurement team.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

The impact of the engagement was the collection of climate change and carbon information from 105 suppliers in 2019, which enabled us to understand that 79 suppliers have structured climate targets, including 9 with approved SBTs and 19 who have intentions to set SBTs within 2 years. We use this information as a foundation for discussions with suppliers on setting structured climate targets and carbon reduction initiatives.

The data captured also, in part, informs our supplier evaluation process by feeding into our supplier "Balanced Scorecards". These scorecards score all suppliers who take part in our bidding processes across 7 different categories, one of which is sustainability and accounts for 12% of a suppliers' total score. The suppliers' scores have a direct impact on sourcing decisions. Within the sustainability category suppliers are scored on their carbon footprint reduction initiatives and their internal renewable energy resources or access to outside sources of renewable energy amongst other indicators.

Success is measured by the percentage of suppliers who respond out of the total number of suppliers requested to respond the CDP Climate Change questionnaire. We target a 100% response rate. 105 (70%) out of a total of 150 suppliers responded to the CDP Climate Change questionnaire in 2019. This is up from 92 supplier responses in 2018 (66%) out of a requested total of 140.

Comment

Type of engagement

Compliance & onboarding

Details of engagement

Code of conduct featuring climate change KPIs

% of suppliers by number

100

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

100

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

100

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

We expect that our World Without Waste goals as well as moving towards more sustainably grown agricultural ingredients across our key commodities will help drive at least half of our future GHG emissions reductions across our value chain.

Therefore, as well as engaging our suppliers on innovations to increase the use of recycled content in packaging, which produces less GHG emissions in comparison to virgin materials, we ask our suppliers of key agricultural ingredients to demonstrate they are meeting the the company's Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP). These define the company's requirements on sustainable agricultural practices, including economic, social and environmental criteria. The SAGP are uniquely targeted at farm level. The SAGP are aligned with leading global third-party sustainable farming standards and assurance schemes such as the Farm Sustainability Assessment of the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAI-FSA), Bonsucro and Rainforest Alliance certifications. The SAGP criteria include KPIs for Energy Management and Climate Protection: Maximize energy use efficiency, seek to maximize the use of renewable energy as available and cost effective, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural practices. Our goal is for 100% of our major agricultural commodities, including sugar, to be sustainably sourced by 2020.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

In 2019, we increased our sustainable sourcing of our 12 priority agricultural ingredients to 54%, compared to 44% in 2019. Sugar, which is our number one agricultural commodity by volume, includes sugarcane, corn and beet sugar. We sourced 32% of sugarcane from farms certified as compliant with our Sustainable Agricultural Guiding Principles, an increase of 7% compared to 2018, 67% of our corn (up from 57% in 2018), and 69% of beet sugar (down from 76% in 2018). A peer-reviewed study published in 2019, supported by the global partnership of WWF and The Coca-Cola Company, found that full adoption of the Bonsucro Standard, which is aligned with our Sustainable Agricultural Guiding Principles, across the sugarcane sector would cut GHG emissions in half while reducing total production area by 24%.

Comment

C12.1b

(C12.1b) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with your customers.

Type of engagement

Collaboration & innovation

Details of engagement

Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce climate change impacts

% of customers by number

70

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

100

Please explain the rationale for selecting this group of customers and scope of engagement

In total, emissions from cold drink equipment accounts for 30-35% of emissions across our value chain. We work closely with our major retail customers and bottlers on innovations to reduce GHG emissions from cold drink equipment, which includes coolers and vending machines. In 2019 the Coca-Cola system engaged with approximately 70% of retail customers, which account for 85% of our sales volume, to provide HFC-free coolers, which use natural refrigerants which have no or only a negligible impact on the climate should they escape to the atmosphere, and more energy efficient coolers through modifications such as LED lighting or intelligent energy management systems. We selected this group of customers and this number, in order to have the largest possible impact in terms of our sales volume within the year.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

In 2019, 918,009 pieces of HFC-free refrigeration equipment were placed in retail customer outlets, which constituted 82% of all coolers introduced in that year. These coolers eliminate the emissions of HFCs, which contribute to global warming up to 4,000 times more than CO₂, and as they are more energy efficient compared to the coolers they are replacing, also reduce energy use in retail customer outlets.

Success is measured by the percentage of our newly purchased refrigeration equipment that is HFC-free. We have a goal to transition to 100% HFC-free coolers on all new purchases by the end of 2020, and we continue to make progress towards this goal, with 82% in 2019.

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

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

Yes

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

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

Management practice reference number

MP1

Management practice

Other, please specify

Sustainable agricultural practices including water management, energy management, natural ecosystem conservation and biodiversity protection, soil management and crop protection

Description of management practice

The quality and integrity of our products depends on a healthy supply chain with successful and thriving farming communities and ecosystems. We believe sustainable agriculture offers solutions to interrelated issues such as human rights, water security, climate resilience, GHG emissions reduction and women's empowerment. We are committed to working with our suppliers to promote sustainable agricultural practices and build supplier capabilities to meet the standards set out in our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP). Our SAGP include maximizing energy efficiency and use of renewable energy in agricultural practices, responsible forest management practices which protect biodiversity and restore degraded ecosystems, maintaining or improving soils by preventing degradation, and the safe and proper use of all agrochemicals. We encourage 100% of our suppliers to demonstrate they are meeting the SAGP criteria by using global sustainable agriculture standards and assurance schemes. The Farm Sustainability Assessment of the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform, the Bonsucro sustainable sugarcane standard and Rainforest Alliance certifications are some of the leading standards we support. As climate change leads to more erratic and extreme weather, more sustainable agricultural practices will play a vital role in promoting resilience across our supply chain and in the communities that provide our agricultural ingredients. While agriculture is a source of greenhouse gas emissions, the practices encouraged in our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles are designed to reduce those emissions and to support healthy soils that ultimately will be capable of sequestering and storing carbon. Along with this climate-positive impact, soils rich in organic matter also hold more water, helping to prevent flooding and erosion, while also mitigating the effects of drought and supporting the resilience of farmers and farming communities.

Your role in the implementation

Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Since establishing the goal of 100% sustainable sourcing of priority ingredients by 2020, we defined our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP) and criteria, which lay out our sustainable sourcing expectations for our suppliers. We integrate sustainable sourcing requirements into supplier contracts and suppliers must establish plans for meeting expectations set forth in the SAGP by 2020.

In addition, through a variety of methods, such as CDP supply chain, personal visits and supplier conferences, our procurement team prioritizes initiatives to support the achievement of our 2020 100% SAGP compliance target. This includes supporting and engaging together with other companies, civil society and third-party experts to advance

better practices, knowledge sharing and technical development for farming communities.

Climate change related benefit

- Emissions reductions (mitigation)
- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
- Increase carbon sink (mitigation)
- Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

Comment

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

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

Yes

C12.3

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

- Direct engagement with policy makers
- Trade associations
- Other

C12.3a

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

Focus of legislation	Corporate position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Other, please specify F-gases	Support	Most new, commercial refrigeration equipment on the market today uses HFC (hydrofluorocarbon) refrigerant, a category of potent greenhouse gases. But safe, reliable, efficient, HFC-free options exist for many end uses already. We have expressed this position globally in the context of the Montreal Protocol deliberations, regionally regarding the EU F-gas legislation and most recently in the US as a signer of the American Business Act on Climate in the lead-up to COP21. The Company was also actively engaged in Paris at COP21 with our bottler	The Company will continue to work with US DOE, US EPA, and US Congress on appropriate solutions for our business.

		Coca-Cola Enterprises, now Coca-Cola European Partners.	
--	--	---	--

C12.3b

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

Yes

C12.3c

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

Trade association

Consumer Goods Forum

Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Please explain the trade association's position

As an active member, we understand The Consumer Goods Forum position to be that climate change is a major strategic threat, one which could affect our customers and their habitats, our businesses and the wider economy and society.

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

Our Company was instrumental in securing an HFC-free commitment on behalf of the full CGF membership in 2010 and helped coordinate three Refrigeration Summits for CGF Members to advance progress on these commitments. Our Chairman and CEO is Vice Co-Chair of the CGF's Board of Directors.

C12.3e

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

As part of the lead up to and duration of COP21 and at COP22 we participated in a number of engagement activities. Some examples include participating in the We Mean Business Road to Paris Commitments including "Reduce short-lived climate pollutant emissions and "Low Carbon Technology Partnerships Initiative." We joined the White House-initiated American Business Act on Climate Pledge to demonstrate our "support for action on climate change and the conclusion of a climate change agreement in Paris that takes a strong step forward toward a low-carbon, sustainable future. We served as one of 40 American companies and NGOs to sign onto a campaign advocating for low-carbon initiatives in the US under the umbrella Business Backs a Low-Carbon USA. We were a signatory of Ceres Climate Leadership Statement, 40 American companies and NGOs to sign onto a campaign advocating for low-carbon initiatives in the US. We engaged with Caring for Climate and the Caring for Climate Business Forum during COP21. As part of our engagement during

COP21, we exhibited as a part of the public facing exhibition at Grand Palais in Paris and ran a series of Climate related articles on our external company website. At COP22, we participated in panels at the Sustainable Innovation Forum. We actively participated in COP23. Delegates attended the Sustainable Innovation Forum and our Senior Director for Environmental Impact spoke as a panelist on our climate commitments.

We are engaging regularly on an ongoing basis with the World Wildlife Fund on the development of Science-based Targets for The Coca-Company.

C12.3f

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

A cross functional core team, consisting of representatives from Sustainability, Legal, Public Affairs, Technical, Procurement, R&D, our bottling partners and our 17 geographical Business Units, meets each month to discuss global climate strategy, climate policy and policy engagement activities, and stakeholder engagement across all geographies in which we operate. All direct and indirect climate-related policy engagement activities are reviewed to ensure they are supportive and consistent with the Company's climate protection strategy. The cross functional team takes outputs from these discussions and elevates issues as necessary to the Company's Leadership Team, Enterprise Risk Management, and Board of Directors.

C12.4

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


Publication

In mainstream reports

Status

Complete

Attach the document

 coca-cola-business-and-sustainability-report-2019.pdf

Page/Section reference

p.23: Emission reduction targets, progress and strategy.

p.23 Climate change governance.

p.24 Climate risks and impacts aligned with the TCFD recommendations

p.24 Approach to climate resilience

p.25 Financial losses incurred due to extreme weather events

Content elements

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

No further comments

C13. Other land management impacts

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

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

No

C15. Signoff

C-FI

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

None

C15.1

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

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Chairman and Chief Executive Officer	Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I am submitting to	Public or Non-Public Submission	Are you ready to submit the additional Supply Chain Questions?
I am submitting my response	Investors Customers	Public	Yes, submit Supply Chain Questions now

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms