



General Mills Inc.

## 2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire

# Contents

<b>C1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>9</b>
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? .....	9
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. ....	9
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. ....	9
(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years....	10
(1.4.1) What is your organization’s annual revenue for the reporting period? .....	10
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. ....	10
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? .....	10
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. ....	11
(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities? .....	12
(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure? .....	12
(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source. ....	13
(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue? .....	19
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? .....	28
(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)? .....	29
<b>C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities .....</b>	<b>31</b>
(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? .....	31
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? .....	32
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? .....	33
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization’s process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. ....	33
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? .....	44
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? .....	44
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? .....	45
(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health? .....	46

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities.	47
---	----

**C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities ..... 52**

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?	52
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?	54
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?	54
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.	54
(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.	54
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?	55
(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?	56

**C4. Governance ..... 58**

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?	58
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?	59
(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.	59
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?	63
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?	65
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	65
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?	69
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	71
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?	74
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.	74
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?	80
(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?	80
(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?	82

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year. ....	88
(4.12) Have you published information about your organization’s response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response? .....	92
(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization’s response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication. ....	92

**C5. Business strategy..... 97**

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? .....	97
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization’s scenario analysis. ....	98
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization’s scenario analysis. ....	104
(5.2) Does your organization’s strategy include a climate transition plan?.....	106
(5.4) In your organization’s financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition? .....	108
(5.9) What is the trend in your organization’s water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?.....	109
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?.....	110
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? .....	110
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? .....	111
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?.....	114
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization’s purchasing process? .....	116
(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization’s purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place. ....	118
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization’s supplier engagement on environmental issues. ....	123
(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity.....	129
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. ....	131
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement? .....	136

**C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach ..... 138**

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.....	138
--	-----

**C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change..... 141**

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....	141
--	-----

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?.....	141
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? .....	141
(7.1.3) Have your organization’s base year emissions and past years’ emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?....	142
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. ....	143
(7.3) Describe your organization’s approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. ....	143
(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?.....	144
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. ....	144
(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? .....	153
(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? .....	153
(7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. ....	154
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. ....	164
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. ....	165
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. ....	166
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. ....	168
(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year? .....	169
(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year. ....	170
(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure? .....	176
(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?.....	176
(7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions. ....	176
(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business? .....	177
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?.....	183
(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP). ....	183
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. ....	185
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ....	193
(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division. ....	193
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity. ....	194

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure? .....	196
(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category. ....	196
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ....	196
(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division. ....	197
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. ....	197
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?.....	198
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.....	198
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?.....	231
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? .....	231
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? .....	232
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. ....	232
(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.....	233
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel. ....	236
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. ....	236
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year. ....	241
(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7. ....	244
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. ....	272
(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations. ....	285
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? .....	287
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. ....	287
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?.....	316
(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production. ....	316
(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases. ....	319
(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings. ....	319
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. ....	320
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? .....	321

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits? .....	323
(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice. ....	323
(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged? .....	325
(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation? .....	325
(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation. ....	325
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?.....	327
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? .....	327
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products. ....	327
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?.....	328

**C8. Environmental performance - Forests..... 329**

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?.....	329
(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity. ....	329
(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes. ....	329
(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel? .....	341
(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year? .....	341
(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year. ....	342
(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them. ....	343
(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.....	353
(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.....	353
(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities. .	354
(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date. ....	355
(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.....	356
(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities. ....	358

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes. ....	358
(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes. ....	359
(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members. ....	359
(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain? .....	360
(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details. ....	360
(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals? .....	361
(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation. ....	362
(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year. ....	362
(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in. ....	365
(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains? .....	366
(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains. ....	366
(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection? .....	367
(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s). ....	367

**C9. Environmental performance - Water security ..... 371**

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? .....	371
(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions. ....	371
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? .....	372
(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change? .....	380
(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change. ....	383
(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress? .....	384
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. ....	390
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination. ....	393
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge. ....	396

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? .....	402
(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.....	404
(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified? .....	411
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member? .....	413
(9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member. ....	413
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency. ....	418
(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source. ....	419
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? .....	426
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?.....	427
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? .....	427
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. ....	427
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made. ....	429

**C13. Further information & sign off ..... 438**

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party? .....	438
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?.....	438
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. ....	439
(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.....	439

## C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

English

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

Select from:

USD

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

#### (1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

Publicly traded organization

#### (1.3.3) Description of organization

*One of the world's leading food companies, General Mills operates in more than 100 countries and markets more than 100 consumer brands, including Cheerios, Haagen-Dazs, Nature Valley, Pillsbury, Old El Paso, Progresso, Yoplait, Cascadian Farm, Annie's, Muir Glen, Yoki, and Blue Buffalo. Headquartered in Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, General Mills had fiscal 2024 global net sales of more than \$19 billion. For more than 150 years, General Mills has been making food the world loves. For us that has always meant ensuring our food is a reflection of our ability to do good for our people, planet and communities. That central mission is at the heart of General Mills. But we have never believed in growth for growth's sake. At General Mills, we work to create holistic value throughout our value chain, from agriculture and operations to our consumers and communities. Below are some highlights of our progress in fiscal 2024 from our 2025 Global Responsibility Report (GRR). • 100 percent of our company owned production facilities are Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI) certified • 45 percent of General Mills global volume met the company's criteria as Nutrition Forward Foods • General Mills is the largest provider of natural and organic packaged food in the US (includes food for both humans and pets) • We will advance regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030 • 100 percent of our 10 priority ingredients are sustainability sourced • 93 percent of General Mills packaging recyclable or reusable (by weight) • 99 percent renewable electricity sourced for our global operations • 88 percent of our employees say that General Mills is a great place to work • We gave US \$128.9 million to charitable causes in fiscal 2024, including food donations and philanthropic funding • Our product donations to food banks enabled 44 million meals around the world in fiscal 2024*

[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	05/26/2024	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

19854000000

**(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.**

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use this unique identifier?	Provide your unique identifier
ISIN code - equity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	US3703341046
CUSIP number	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	370334104
Ticker symbol	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	GIS
D-U-N-S number	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	006250740

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> China  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canada                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> India  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> France                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Italy  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greece                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spain  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mexico                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brazil   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Belgium                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Germany  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Taiwan, China            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ireland  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Republic of Korea        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Australia  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hong Kong SAR, China     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Singapore  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Arab Emirates     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Switzerland  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States of America |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |  |

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, this is confidential data	No, this is confidential data

[Fixed row]

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

#### Production

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

Select from:

Value chain (excluding own land)

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

Select from:

Do not own/manage land

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

General Mills does not own/manage land

#### Processing/ Manufacturing

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

Select from:

Direct operations

## Distribution

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

Select from:

Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

## Consumption

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

Select from:

Yes

[Fixed row]

## (1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.

### Timber products

#### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

#### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

Manufacturing

#### (1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- No, the total volume is confidential

### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- Primary packaging
- Secondary packaging
- Tertiary packaging

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

Select from:

- No, not disclosing

### (1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

- Data is confidential

## Palm oil

### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Manufacturing

### (1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- Yes, we are providing the total volume

### (1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

97732

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

Select from:

- No

### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- Palm oil derivatives
- Refined palm oil

### (1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

- 1-5%

### (1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

- 1-10%

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

Select from:

- Yes, disclosing

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

Select from:

Yes

### (1.22.19) Please explain

*General Mills' commitment to source 100% of our palm oil from responsible and sustainable sources was achieved in 2015 through the purchase of RSPO certified volumes. We have continued to maintain that performance year on year, including a purchasing shift toward mass balance and segregated oil and away from certificates. Our aggregated purchasing volumes for 2024 are provided here as well as in our Statement on Responsible Palm Oil sourcing. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

## Soy

### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

Manufacturing

### (1.22.3) Indicate if you have direct soy and/or embedded soy in your value chain

Select from:

Mixture of embedded soy and direct soy

### (1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No, the total volume is confidential

### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- Embedded soy [soy row only]
- Soybean oil

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

Select from:

- No, not disclosing

#### (1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

- Data is confidential

### Cocoa

#### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- Sourced

#### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Manufacturing

#### (1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- No, the total volume is confidential

#### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- Other, please specify :Cocoa

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

Select from:

- No, not disclosing

### (1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

- Data is confidential

## Coffee

### (1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- Sourced

### (1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Manufacturing

### (1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

- No, the total volume is confidential

### (1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- Other, please specify :Ready to Drink

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

Select from:

No, not disclosing

### (1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

*Select all that apply*

Data is confidential

*[Fixed row]*

**(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?**

### **Cotton**

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

*Select from:*

No

### **Dairy & egg products**

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

*Select from:*

Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

*Select from:*

31-40%

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

*Select from:*

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Dairy is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, including Yoplait and Haagen-Dazs. We take a holistic approach to supporting dairies on managing their dairy ecosystem including feed, animals and manure. This approach, along with the principles of regenerative agriculture, will help us decarbonize our dairy supply. This is relevant in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the dairy value chain. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

### Fish and seafood from aquaculture

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

Select from:

No

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources seafood for our Pet segment. The amount sourced is insignificant to the business in terms of revenue.*

### Fruit

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources a small amount of fruit for use as flavors and ingredients in brands such as Yoplait and Hagen-Dazs. The quantity sourced is not considered significant to the business in terms of revenue.*

## Maize/corn

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

11-20%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources a small amount of corn that is used with other grains in cereal and snack bars, canned sweet corn, and popcorn. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

#### Nuts

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

11-20%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Nuts is a significant agricultural commodity for many products as they are often a key flavor or functional component in General Mills brands, including Nature Valley, Larabar, and some cereals. General Mills is focused on advancing regenerative production systems within our nuts supply sheds (such as almonds in California) because of its connection to water stewardship, advancing regenerative agriculture, and the impact on climate change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

#### Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

21-30%

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

Select from:

Yes

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills is a significant buyer of oats for multiple brands, including large scale brands Cheerios and Nature Valley. We are focused on regenerative practices in our oat supply sheds as it is relevant both in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the oat value chain. We purchase wheat, oat, corn and other grains to support our several of our businesses. These key agricultural ingredients require soil, water, sunlight, carbon and fertilizer to germinate, grow and mature for harvest. Fertilizer production, on-farm fertilizer usage, diesel-burning farm equipment and soil carbon loss are some of the main sources of emissions for grains used in our products. We are focused on advancing regenerative agriculture in our oat sourcing regions, and priority actions include improving soil health and nutrient cycling and improving fertilizer efficiency. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

### Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

51-60%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources other oilseeds such as canola oil, soybean oil, cottonseed oil, sunflower oil, and others that are used in a variety of our business units including Morning Foods, Snacks, Foodservice and others. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity. Despite the number of items containing other oilseeds, we do not consider this significant to our business due to the availability of substitutes within this commodity category.*

## Poultry & hog

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources a small amount of Poultry & Hog products for use in our Pet Segment and in brands such as Progresso Soup and Totinos Pizza. The quantity sourced is not considered significant to the business in terms of revenue.*

## Rice

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

1-10%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources a small amount of rice for use in our Pet Segment and in brands such as Progresso Soup. The quantity sourced is not considered significant to the business in terms of revenue.*

## Sugar

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

81-90%

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Sugar is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, used in cereal, snacks, yogurt/ice cream, baked goods and other many other products. General Mills works to advance regenerative agriculture practices in sugar because of its relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the sugar value chain. Sugar, both from beet and cane plants, were two of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

#### Tea

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

#### Tobacco

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

#### Vegetable

#### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

#### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

11-20%

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

Select from:

No

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*General Mills sources vegetables for use as flavor in our Pet Segment and brands such as Progresso Soup and Totinos Pizza. The quantity sourced is not considered significant to the business in terms of revenue.*

## Wheat

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

### (1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

41-50%

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

Select from:

Yes

### (1.23.4) Please explain

*Wheat is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, including Big G Cereals like Wheaties, Gold Medal Flour, and Betty Crocker. General Mills is focused on regenerative practices in our wheat supply sheds as it is relevant both in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the wheat value chain. We purchase wheat, oat, corn and other grains to support our several of our businesses. These key agricultural ingredients require soil, water, sunlight, carbon and fertilizer to germinate, grow and mature for harvest. Fertilizer production, on-farm fertilizer usage, diesel-burning farm equipment and soil carbon loss are some of the main sources of emissions for grains used in our products. We are focused on advancing regenerative agriculture in our wheat sourcing regions, and priority actions include improving soil health and nutrient cycling and improving fertilizer efficiency. Percent of revenue*

dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

## Other commodity

### (1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

[Fixed row]

## (1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

### (1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

### (1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

Upstream value chain

Downstream value chain

### (1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

Tier 1 suppliers

### (1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

Tier 2 suppliers

## (1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

- Smallholders relevant and included

## (1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

*We recently conducted a Double Materiality Assessment to prepare for CSRD regulation requirements. To fulfill the disclosure requirements of ESRS 2, we mapped our value chain. We started by reviewing internal and external reports. Then validated the value chain mapping with our Sourcing and Supply Chain Risk teams, considering both upstream and downstream perspectives.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?

### Palm oil

#### (1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

- Yes

#### (1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

- Tier 1 suppliers

#### (1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

- 100%

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

Select from:

Tier 2 suppliers

*[Fixed row]*

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

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

### Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

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

*Aligns to time horizons used in recent double materiality assessment done in preparation for CSRD. Please note: General Mills is working to conduct materiality and risk assessments in preparation global ESG regulations. The specific risks and opportunities identified will be disclosed once the assessment is complete and reviewed/approved within the proper governance structure in the organization. At this time, as the work is still in progress, we will not be disclosing information about specific or substantive risks and opportunities in this CDP disclosure as we want to ensure we are providing our stakeholders with only the most accurate and complete information. We have, however, recently completed a water risk assessment, so details about watersheds will be shared when appropriate in this CDP disclosure.*

### Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

2

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

*Aligns to time horizons used in double materiality assessment done in preparation for CSRD*

### Long-term

#### (2.1.1) From (years)

6

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

Select from:

Yes

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

*Aligns to time horizons used in double materiality assessment done in preparation for CSRD*

*[Fixed row]*

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

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both dependencies and impacts

*[Fixed row]*

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

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both risks and opportunities	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

**Row 1**

**(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue**

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain

### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

- Full

### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

*Select all that apply*

- Tier 1 suppliers

### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

- Qualitative and quantitative

### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

*Select from:*

- Every two years

### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

*Select all that apply*

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- Site-specific
- Sub-national
- National

### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

- Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) scenarios.

Other

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

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- Heat waves
- Wildfires

Chronic physical

- Heat stress
- Precipitation or hydrological variability

Water stress

Policy

Carbon pricing mechanisms

Market

Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Changing customer behavior

Reputation

Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

#### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

Customers

Local communities

Employees

Investors

Suppliers

Regulators

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

Select from:

No

#### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*Beginning in 2023, General Mills engaged a global sustainability nonprofit to conduct a climate risk assessment and explore the strategic implications for the company under three scenarios for 2050. The project involved the following steps: 1) Scenario development: Used three climate scenarios developed by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) - Current Policies, Net Zero 2050 and Delayed Transition. Each of the scenarios' narratives was augmented by adding content about how a range of business-relevant topics might plausibly play out in each. 2) Identification of climate-related risks and opportunities: Six group interviews were convened, each involving 4-6 participants from a range of business units and functions to analyze impacts of the three scenarios and identify climate-related (transition and physical) risks and opportunities. 3) Strategic implications: A cross-functional workshop was conducted with nearly 30 internal General Mills*

stakeholders to validate the risk and opportunity assessment, discuss hotspots that emerge from the identified risks and opportunities, and develop mitigation options to enhance the company's resilience and refine our strategy around those hotspots common across the three scenarios. n Action planning: An executive-level follow-up session of the workshop was conducted to identify next steps on the most important issues to improve strategic climate resilience. This assessment was followed up in 2024 by a climate and nature risk assessment, which will be used to inform ongoing strategy and disclosures.

## Row 2

### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Forests

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

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Upstream value chain

### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- Partial

### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

#### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- Annually

#### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

#### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

- A specific environmental risk management process

#### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- Site-specific
- Sub-national
- National

#### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Other

- Desk-based research
- External consultants
- Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

- Change in land-use

Policy

- Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards
- Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

Market

- Uncertainty about commodity origin and/or legality

Technology

- Data access/availability or monitoring systems

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- NGOs
- Customers
- Employees
- Investors
- Suppliers
- Local communities

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

*Select from:*

No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*As a food and beverage company that provides products to a global consumer base, the availability of forest risk commodities, particularly palm oil, is one of the most significant forests issues to our company. We assessed the significance of this issue through the support of our external consultant, Proforest. Proforest works with governments, producers and other private sector partners, as well as civil society organizations and NGOs throughout agricultural and forest product supply chains assess risk and advise action. They conducted a supplier risk assessment and engaged with our palm oil suppliers to identify whether they are in compliance with our palm oil sourcing policy, which includes clear transparency and traceability. Through Proforests' assessment, it was found that suppliers that were more transparent in their palm oil sourcing helped General Mills ensure the availability of these raw materials. Our suppliers have agreed to provide information relating both to the traceability of their palm oil and the measures they are taking to ensure compliance with our sourcing policy. In 2022, we continued working with Proforest to trace our palm oil supply chain, identify sustainability risks and ensure responsible and sustainable sourcing. By December 2022, 97% of our palm oil volume was categorized as traceable to the extraction mill.*

### Row 3

#### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

*Select all that apply*

Water

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

*Select all that apply*

Dependencies

Impacts

Risks

Opportunities

#### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

Direct operations

Upstream value chain

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- Full

#### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

#### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- Every three years or more

#### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

#### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

- A specific environmental risk management process

#### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- Site-specific
- Local
- Sub-national
- National

### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

- WRI Aqueduct
- WWF Water Risk Filter
- Other commercially/publicly available tools, please specify :McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter

Other

- Scenario analysis

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- Drought
- Wildfires
- Subsidence
- Pollution incident
- Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

- Soil erosion
- Water stress
- Soil degradation
- Groundwater depletion
- Declining water quality
- Declining ecosystem services
- Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- Increased severity of extreme weather events
- Water availability at a basin/catchment level

- Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability
- Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

#### Policy

- Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
- Changes to national legislation
- Limited or lack of river basin management

#### Market

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

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NGOs                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulators                                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customers                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local communities                              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employees                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indigenous peoples                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Investors                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water utilities at a local level               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suppliers                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other water users at the basin/catchment level |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify : <b>Consumers</b> |  |

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

*Select from:*

- No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in fiscal 2023, in partnership with World Wildlife Fund.*  
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

Yes

### **(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed**

*All of our work related to climate, agriculture, deforestation, water are all connected. Each impacts the other and considering how the full system works together is key to our approach in these areas.*

[Fixed row]

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

### **(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations**

Select from:

Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

Direct operations

Upstream value chain

### **(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified**

Sensitive locations

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

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

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

#### (2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in fiscal 2023, in partnership with World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and our priority watersheds through fiscal 2026 are shown below. In all our priority locations, we strive to work in coalitions that advance our positive water impact beyond the scale of General Mills' individual water footprint and invest in healthy watersheds for all stakeholders, including ecosystems.*

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

Select from:

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

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

*2025 Global Responsibility Report\_water map.pdf*  
[Fixed row]

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

#### Risks

#### (2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

Qualitative

#### (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- Likelihood of effect occurring
- Other, please specify :Potential impact

## (2.4.7) Application of definition

*In preparation for CSRD regulation, General Mills is conducting a double materiality assessment, which identifies risks and opportunities. To determine which as substantive, we considered both magnitude and likelihood of occurrence.*

### Opportunities

## (2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- Qualitative

## (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- Likelihood of effect occurring
- Other, please specify :Potential impact

## (2.4.7) Application of definition

*In preparation for CSRD regulation, General Mills is conducting a double materiality assessment, which identifies risks and opportunities. To determine which as substantive, we considered both magnitude and likelihood of occurrence.*

[Add row]

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

## (2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

- Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

## (2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

*We identify and classify potential water pollutants that may have detrimental impacts over water bodies and ecosystems through our Global Safety & Environment function and Water Management internal policy. The purpose of that policy is to promote water conservation and to minimize the discharge of contaminants to water or soil that could cause harm to human health or the environment. All our facilities treat wastewater prior to discharge in accordance with federal and local regulations. For example, our US facilities comply with standards established by the Clean Water Act (EPA federal law and regulations). Through the installation of instrumentation to monitor wastewater parameters, our plants measure and monitor for contaminants to comply with federal local regulations and classify them based on testing categories: chemical oxygen demand; fats, oils and grease; total suspended solids; biological oxygen demand; and ammonia to ensure treatment protocols and measured levels result in compliance with local regulations. Plants monitor and classify potential pollutants by treatment method and then devise a treatment protocol accordingly. Water treatment and control effectiveness should be documented and may be done by: Observation, periodic measurement, or recording process conditions (e.g., pH or temperature). Control device equipment and associated monitoring gauges must be inspected regularly and calibrated as appropriate and be part of a preventative maintenance program.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*As a food manufacturer, water used in plants for sanitation may contain remaining food particles and nutrients suspended in wastewater, such as such as in our Tennessee yogurt and Missouri pet food plants. If nutrients were released into the water system without treatment, it would create potential for eutrophication. We do not discharge untreated wastewater to land or surface waters at any of our locations, though this could be a risk if controls were not in place. Our production facilities are governed by applicable local regulations as well as our compliance management program.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

#### (2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience
- Water recycling
- Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

#### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*We mitigate the risk of discharging wastewater with significant volume of other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants by regularly conducting assessments of the resilience of the critical infrastructures and storage equipment to reduce risk of leaks, spills, pipe erosion, etc. Avoiding leaks and spills prevents untreated water discharge from entering water bodies, which may lead to eutrophication. Our Plant Facilities teams maintain critical infrastructures. All plant employees are empowered to shut down the line if a safety risk is identified. Facilities are required by company policy to develop a treatment plan that complies with local discharge regulations (e.g. municipality requirements). According to their plan, plants treat wastewater prior to discharge in accordance with local regulations. Plants also monitor for contaminants to comply with local regulations for fats, oils and grease; total suspended solids; biological oxygen demand; and chemical oxygen demand to ensure treatment protocols result in compliance with local regulations. Facilities are required by company policy to develop a treatment plan that aligns with local discharge regulations (e.g. municipality requirements). Plants also recycle some water on-site, such as reusing line cleaning water for air scrubbers. Success is measured through all plants having a water monitoring and treatment plan that complies with federal and local discharge regulations (e.g. the Clean Water Act [US EPA standards]).*

### Row 2

#### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- Pesticides

#### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*Pesticide (insecticide, herbicide, and fungicide) application is routine in conventional agriculture, which makes up the vast majority of our ingredient sourcing. In today's global agriculture system, where plant pests and diseases are responsible for losses of 20% to 40% of all food production, farmers rely on pesticides and other tools to protect crops and grow ingredients for the foods we eat. The scale and magnitude are very broad and significant, though not specific to General Mills. Our North America sourcing footprint is about 3 million agricultural acres, a small fraction of the 900 million acres of crop and range land in the US. With a broad set*

*of agricultural commodities sourced globally, there are dozens of potential agricultural water pollutants potentially present in our supply chain. According to EPA, some pesticides have the potential to contaminate drinking water, but whether these contaminants pose a health risk depends on how toxic the pesticides are, how much is in the water, and how much exposure occurs on a daily basis. (<https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol/drinking-water-and-pesticides>). We focus on food safety through supplier management systems, inventory controls, and traceability programs and follow leading regulatory standards. Our practices and policies ensure that our products are safe and comply with regulatory limits.*

### **(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage**

*Select all that apply*

Upstream value chain

### **(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts**

*Select all that apply*

Upgrading of process equipment/methods

Other, please specify :Crop management practicesPesticide managementSubstitution of pesticides for less toxic or environmentally hazardous alternativesFollow regulation standards

### **(2.5.1.5) Please explain**

*We believe in leading with food safety and our systematic approach to food safety includes supplier management systems, inventory controls, and traceability programs. We freely share best practices and collaborate with industry peers and regulators to help raise safety standards industry-wide. In addition, we follow leading regulatory standards. Our practices and policies ensure that our products are safe and comply with regulatory limits. For example, in the U.S. the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sets regulatory limits for pesticide residues in crops. These strict tolerance levels are enforced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Similar procedures are in place in other countries, including through the World Health Organization and U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization's Codex Alimentarius standards. We expect all ingredients we use to be produced in line with applicable standards. We also have a goal to advance regenerative agriculture practices on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030, focusing on principles that promote healthy soil and, long-term, reduce the need for applications of synthetic pesticides and fertilizer. We also support expanding organic acreage through our Organic brands and products. General Mills' family of brands includes Annie's, Cascadian Farm, and Muir Glen. For organic ingredients, we purchase ingredients that come from certified organic farms, which follow strict standards limiting pesticide usage.*

## **Row 3**

### **(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category**

*Select from:*

- Nitrates

### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*Nitrate application is routine in conventional agriculture, which makes up the majority of our ingredient sourcing. With a broad set of agricultural commodities sourced globally, there are dozens of potential agricultural water pollutants, such as nitrates (waterway eutrophication from runoff). According to EPA, overuse of fertilizers has resulted in contamination of surface water and groundwater. For example, in California's Central Valley, one of our key sourcing locations and a priority watershed, over 1 million people lack access to clean water due to agriculture-driven groundwater overdraft and contamination of wells by nitrate leeching. Other areas in General Mills' supply shed being impacted by nitrate runoff include Escault Basin, France (a priority watershed, dairy), the Great Lakes (dairy), and the Gulf of Mexico's deadzone, relevant to General Mills corn, wheat, and rice supply sheds. The scale and magnitude are very broad and significant, for example, nutrient runoff in the Midwest impacts the Gulf of Mexico. We view attention to this impact as part of our duty as a responsible corporate citizen, though we do not currently see it posing a direct risk to our business. General Mills North America sourcing footprint is about 3 million agricultural acres, a small fraction of the 900 million acres of crop and range land in the US.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select all that apply*

- Upstream value chain

### (2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

*Select all that apply*

- Upgrading of process equipment/methods
- Other, please specify :Regenerative agriculture: Soil conservation practices, crop management practices, Sustainable irrigation and drainage management, Fertilizer management

### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*Through F24, we enrolled over 600,000 acres in regenerative agriculture coaching. Each of our pilots provide farmers with practical tools to learn practices with water benefits like cover cropping & no-till, which can significantly reduce nitrate application and runoff. We track outcomes in water across the life of the pilots & will be able to report on results following their completion, such as % improvement in soil water infiltration rate and % reduction in nitrates. Organic and conventional producers both reported strong implementation of three key regenerative agriculture principles: minimize soil disturbance, keep the soil covered, and maintain a living root in the ground year-round, all of which can reduce nitrate contamination of surface and groundwater. Success is measured by assessing key outcomes associated with transitions to regenerative systems including improved soil health (e.g. % decrease in nitrate application) and total acres advancing regenerative agriculture principles, including practices associated with reduced nitrate application like number of acres with cover cropping. We funded increased staff capacity and cost-share for farmers implementing regen ag the Red River, a critical sugar sourcing location. In year 1, 43 farmers (6232 acres) registered. Estimated water pollution reduction impact from the Wilkin County Soil Health Incentive Program included 7478 lbs of nitrate reduced (1.2 lbs/acre).*

*[Add row]*

### C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

#### Climate change

##### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

No

##### (3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

Evaluation in progress

##### (3.1.3) Please explain

*As part of our work to prepare for upcoming regulatory disclosures, General Mills is engaging in a double materiality assessment to be able to identify substantive impacts, risks and opportunities. As that work is currently still underway, we cannot disclose information about specific risks or opportunities at this time. We plan to disclose once the analysis is final and has gone through the company's review and governance processes. However, we are providing background and context on our latest climate risk assessment and scenario analysis as asked about in subsequent questions.*

#### Forests

##### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

No

### (3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

Evaluation in progress

### (3.1.3) Please explain

*As part of our work to prepare for upcoming regulatory disclosures, General Mills is engaging in a double materiality assessment to be able to identify substantive impacts, risks and opportunities. As that work is currently still underway, we cannot disclose information about specific risks or opportunities at this time. We plan to disclose once the analysis is final and has gone through the company's review and governance processes. However, General Mills is focused on forest positive strategies for commodities at high risk of deforestation and where we can make a meaningful impact so stakeholders will find information about that in this disclosure.*

## Water

### (3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

No

### (3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

Evaluation in progress

### (3.1.3) Please explain

*As part of our work to prepare for upcoming regulatory disclosures, General Mills is engaging in a double materiality assessment to be able to identify substantive impacts, risks and opportunities. As that work is currently still underway, we cannot disclose information about specific risks or opportunities at this time. We plan to disclose once the analysis is final and has gone through the company's review and governance processes. However, as a result of our most recent water risk assessment, we are providing information on locations where we are exposed to water-related risks as asked about in the following questions.*  
[Fixed row]

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

**(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations**

Select from:

Yes

**(3.3.2) Fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties**

Select all that apply

Enforcement orders or other penalties but none that are considered as significant

**(3.3.3) Comment**

*In fiscal 24, we had one incident related to water quality and/or quality permits, standards or regulations; a fine was received and resolution is in progress. As this is still in progress, no additional specifics on details or amounts are able to be shared at this time.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select all that apply

Other carbon tax, please specify :Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan

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

**Other carbon tax, please specify**

### (3.5.3.1) Period start date

05/29/2023

### (3.5.3.2) Period end date

05/26/2024

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

1

### (3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

43398

### (3.5.3.5) Comment

*Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan: Our Winnipeg, Manitoba facility is subject to a Carbon Tax that is part of the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan, on gas, liquid or solid fuel products intended for combustion, at price per tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2 eq). This tax is directly passed on to us in our utility invoices as a charge per M3 of natural gas. Over the course of the reporting year, the cost has ranged from 0.12 per M3 to 0.15 per M3. We are addressing this tax internally by reducing our utility usage through the 5 Step Energy Process. Examples of work already completed at Winnipeg includes having an assessment completed for lighting as well as studies completed related to the compressed air supply and compressed air demand systems and subsequently implemented improvements based on the assessment recommendations. Please note this facility represents less than 1% of the company's scope 1 emissions, so have noted "1" in the relevant field as that is the smallest unit available for entry in the answer.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

*In the reporting year, our fiscal year 2024, to comply with the systems we are regulated by (Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan) our usage is monitored and payments are facilitated by the utility company. Manitoba Hydro is the only utility company that provides Natural Gas and also monitors through monthly reading. The payment is calculated based on Natural Gas consumption which is monitored by the utility company (Government of Manitoba) called Manitoba Hydro. Manitoba Hydro will apply rates according to the changes required by the law. Because Manitoba Hydro is monitoring the usage at our facility and applying the correct rates per the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan this ensure that our facility is in compliance with the Made in Manitoba Climate and Green Plan.*

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

## **Climate change**

### **(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified**

Select from:

No

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

Select from:

Evaluation in progress

### **(3.6.3) Please explain**

*As part of our work to prepare for upcoming regulatory disclosures, General Mills is engaging in a double materiality assessment to be able to identify substantive impacts, risks and opportunities. As that work is currently still underway, we cannot disclose information about specific risks or opportunities at this time. We plan to disclose once the analysis is final and has gone through the company's review and governance processes.*

## **Forests**

### **(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified**

Select from:

No

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

Select from:

Evaluation in progress

### **(3.6.3) Please explain**

*As part of our work to prepare for upcoming regulatory disclosures, General Mills is engaging in a double materiality assessment to be able to identify substantive impacts, risks and opportunities. As that work is currently still underway, we cannot disclose information about specific risks or opportunities at this time. We plan to disclose once the analysis is final and has gone through the company's review and governance processes.*

## **Water**

### **(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified**

Select from:

No

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

Select from:

Evaluation in progress

### **(3.6.3) Please explain**

*As part of our work to prepare for upcoming regulatory disclosures, General Mills is engaging in a double materiality assessment to be able to identify substantive impacts, risks and opportunities. As that work is currently still underway, we cannot disclose information about specific risks or opportunities at this time. We plan to disclose once the analysis is final and has gone through the company's review and governance processes.*

[Fixed row]

## C4. Governance

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

#### (4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

Yes

#### (4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

Executive directors or equivalent

Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

#### (4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

Yes, and it is publicly available

#### (4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

*Bringing together informed directors with different perspectives, in a well-managed, transparent and constructive environment, fosters thoughtful and innovative decision making. We have a policy of encouraging a range of tenures on the board, to ensure both continuity and fresh perspectives among our director nominees. Our current director nominees possess a broad range of backgrounds and experiences and a balanced mix of diversity that enriches board discussions and deliberations: As reported in our fiscal 2024 Proxy statement, four of our 12 independent directors are ethnically diverse and six are female. In addition, the board exhibits a balanced mix of tenure, with an average director tenure of seven years. Diversity has been a core value of our board and the company for many years. We have had at least one female director and one ethnically diverse director on our board for each fiscal year since 1975. We are committed to maintaining the current*

diversity of the board and will look for opportunities to increase the diversity of the board where appropriate to enhance the overall skills, experiences and profile of the board.

**(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)**

2024 proxy statement.pdf  
 [Fixed row]

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

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from:	Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from:	Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from:	Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to within the next two years	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify :Considered part of other environmental issues, like regenerative agriculture and water	Biodiversity is embedded in our other strategic priorities and is not currently viewed as a standalone issue.

[Fixed row]

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

**Climate change**

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

Select all that apply

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

Select all that apply

- Board mandate

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

Select from:

- Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

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

Select all that apply

- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*The Public Responsibility Committee (PRC) of General Mills' Board of Directors regularly reviews the company's sustainability objectives, strategies and performance, including environmental and climate. For example, the committee regularly receives updates on and oversees progress against our goals and targets, such as our goal to reduce emissions by 30% by 2030 and net zero emissions by 2050. This is one way our climate-related issues are incorporated into board*

discussions. In addition, as an example of the PRC's responsibility, the committee reviewed and approved General Mills' 2024 Global Responsibility Report, which is company's primary disclosure to stakeholders on climate and other ESG issues. The committee also reviews public policy issues and social trends affecting General Mills; monitors our corporate citizenship activities and sustainability programs, including environmental and climate; evaluates our policies in the context of emerging corporate social responsibility issues; and reviews our policies governing political contributions and our record of contributions.

## Forests

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

Select all that apply

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

Select all that apply

- Board mandate

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*The Global Impact Governance Committee (GIGC), led by our Chairman and CEO and overseen by the Board's Public Responsibility committee, is accountable for our sustainability program. The Chairman and CEO convenes the GIGC at least three times each year to establish, direct and oversee General Mills' positions on matters of significance to the company and its stakeholders concerning corporate social responsibility, environmental and sustainability issues, and philanthropy. This includes deforestation issues that could affect commodity availability and prices. It guides strategy, reviews and approves public commitments, approves resourcing and ensures public commitments are carried out. The GIGC consists of 5 or more members of the Company's senior team appointed by the Chair, who is the Chairman & CEO.*

## Water

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

*Select all that apply*

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- Board-level committee

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

*Select from:*

- Yes

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

*Select all that apply*

- Board mandate

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

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

- Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*The Global Impact Governance Committee (GIGC), led by our Chairman and CEO and overseen by the Board's Public Responsibility committee, is accountable for our sustainability program. The Chairman and CEO convenes the GIGC at least three times each year to establish, direct and oversee General Mills' positions on matters of significance to the company and its stakeholders concerning corporate social responsibility, environmental and sustainability issues, and philanthropy. This includes water-related issues such as droughts, floods, and water-related policy changes that could affect crop yields and prices. The Committee consists of five or more members of the Company's senior leadership team and the chair of the Committee is the CEO. In F22, the GIGC approved an update to General Mills' water stewardship strategy for integration with regenerative agriculture and approved investments in key regenerative agriculture projects in Canada and the United States targeting water outcomes. The GIGC also evaluated and approved General Mills' refreshed watershed prioritization as reflected in this disclosure.*

[Fixed row]

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

### Climate change

#### (4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes

#### (4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
- Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
- Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

### (4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

- Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

## Forests

### (4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Not assessed

## Water

### (4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes

### (4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
- Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

### (4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Other

- Other, please specify :The Chairman & CEO has competence on water-related issues, which we have assessed based on awareness building and education done by the Global Impact Team and by his engagement in external forums oriented to water impact.

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

#### Climate change

##### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

##### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

#### **(4.3.1.4) Reporting line**

Select from:

- Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

- Quarterly

#### **(4.3.1.6) Please explain**

*The General Mills global impact governance committee, led by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, is responsible for our global responsibility programs. The purpose of the global impact governance committee is to establish, direct and oversee General Mills' position on matters of significance to the company and its stakeholders concerning corporate social responsibility, environmental, climate and sustainability issues and philanthropy. The Chairman and Chief Executive Officer convenes the global impact governance committee, which consists of 5 or more members of the senior leadership team, at least three times per year.*

## **Forests**

#### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

#### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

#### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

*Select from:*

- Reports to the board directly

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

*Select from:*

- Annually

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*The General Mills global impact governance committee, led by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, is responsible for our global responsibility programs. The purpose of the global impact governance committee is to establish, direct and oversee General Mills' position on matters of significance to the company and its stakeholders concerning corporate social responsibility, environmental, climate and sustainability issues and philanthropy. The Chairman and Chief Executive Officer convenes the global impact governance committee, which consists of 5 or more members of the senior leadership team, at least three times per year.*

## Water

### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

Annually

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*The General Mills global impact governance committee, led by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, is responsible for our global responsibility programs. The purpose of the global impact governance committee is to establish, direct and oversee General Mills' position on matters of significance to the company and its stakeholders concerning corporate social responsibility, environmental, climate and sustainability issues and philanthropy. The Chairman and Chief Executive Officer convenes the global impact governance committee, which consists of 5 or more members of the senior leadership team, at least three times per year.*

### Biodiversity

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*Biodiversity is embedded within our broader regenerative agriculture and water programs, and not considered a standalone topic. Biodiversity content would be covered as appropriate within the GIGC as it relates to achieving corporate commitments.*

[Add row]

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

### Climate change

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

Select from:

Yes

#### (4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

0

### (4.5.3) Please explain

*While we do not have a set percentage (that's why noting "0" in prior question), environmental and sustainability performance are included in our Chairman and CEO's annual performance objectives. Progress on sustainability programs, including climate, are considered as part of his annual performance evaluation, and can impact his compensation.*

## Forests

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

Select from:

Yes

### (4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

0

### (4.5.3) Please explain

*The Chief Sustainability Officer has responsibility for all corporate environmental commitments and annual targets, including forest-related targets such as our 2025 No Deforestation commitment and 2030 GHG emissions reduction target. Performance and progress on these functional goals are traced through our monthly red/green review process. At the end of the fiscal year, completion of annual forest-related priorities is rolled up into the CSO's overall deliverables. All employees, including the CSO, receive annual performance ratings and then receive incentives calculated based on business performance and individual performance. The CSO and other Officers' incentives are calculated based on 80% business performance and 20% individual performance. This is used to calculate annual monetary rewards (bonus, merit increase, and equity). The specific percentage linked to Forests alone is not set, therefore we have noted "0" in the prior question.*

## Water

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

Select from:

Yes

### (4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

0

### (4.5.3) Please explain

*The Chief Sustainability Officer has responsibility for all corporate environmental commitments and annual targets, including water and water-related targets such as our 1 million acre agriculture commitment. Performance and progress on these functional goals are traced through our monthly red/green review process. At the end of the fiscal year, completion of annual water-related priorities is rolled up into the CSO's overall deliverables. All employees, including the CSO, receive annual performance ratings and then receive incentives calculated based on business performance and individual performance. The CSO and other Officers' incentives are calculated based on 80% business performance and 20% individual performance. This is used to calculate annual monetary rewards (bonus, merit increase, and equity). The specific percentage linked to water alone is not set, therefore we have noted "0" in the prior question.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

#### Climate change

#### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

#### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

Bonus - % of salary

#### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

Progress towards environmental targets

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Managing the company's climate program is one of the items in the CSO's annual objectives and impacts the CSO's performance rating and resulting incentive.*

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

*Aligning leadership incentives with our priorities helps to underscore the importance of making progress against our targets and signals to the organization that these are programs we need to all focus on.*

### Forests

#### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

- Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

#### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- Bonus - % of salary

#### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- Progress towards environmental targets

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*The Chief Sustainability Officer has responsibility for all corporate environmental commitments and annual targets, including water and water-related targets such as our 1 million acre agriculture commitment. Performance and progress on these functional goals are traced through our monthly red/green review process. At the end of the fiscal year, completion of annual water-related priorities is rolled up into the CSO's overall deliverables. All employees, including the CSO, receive annual performance ratings and then receive incentives calculated based on business performance and individual performance. The CSO and other Officers' incentives are calculated based on 80% business performance and 20% individual performance. This is used to calculate annual monetary rewards (bonus, merit increase, and equity). The specific percentage linked to water alone is not set, therefore we have noted "0" in the prior question.*

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

*Aligning leadership incentives with our priorities helps to underscore the importance of making progress against our targets and signals to the organization that these are programs we need to all focus on.*

### Water

#### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

- Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

#### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

*Select all that apply*

- Bonus - % of salary

#### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- Progress towards environmental targets

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*The Chief Sustainability Officer has responsibility for all corporate environmental commitments and annual targets, including No Deforestation and forests-related targets such as our 2030 GHG emissions reductions target. Performance and progress on these functional goals are traced through our monthly red/green review process. At the end of the fiscal year, completion of annual forests-related priorities is rolled up into the CSO's overall deliverables. All employees, including the CSO, receive annual performance ratings and then receive incentives calculated based on business performance and individual performance. The CSO and other Officers' incentives are calculated based on 80% business performance and 20% individual performance. This is used to calculate annual monetary rewards (bonus, merit increase, and equity)*

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

*Aligning leadership incentives with our priorities helps to underscore the importance of making progress against our targets and signals to the organization that these are programs we need to all focus on.*

[Add row]

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

	<b>Does your organization have any environmental policies?</b>
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

#### (4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

## Row 1

### (4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Climate change

### (4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain

### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*Consistent with SBTi guidelines, our climate policy and target focus on the categories of GHG emissions that are the most impactful and actionable for General Mills. This covers our entire value chain, from direct operations as well as upstream and downstream. For our 2030 science-based target, we define our emissions boundaries in alignment with the Science-based Target initiative (SBTi).*

### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

- Commitment to 100% renewable energy
- Commitment to net-zero emissions

Additional references/Descriptions

- Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

*Select all that apply*

- Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

#### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

*Select from:*

- Publicly available

#### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

*General Mills Climate Policy.pdf*

### Row 2

#### (4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

*Select all that apply*

- Forests

#### (4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

*Select from:*

- Selected commodities only

#### (4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- Upstream value chain

#### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*To drive positive outcomes for both people and planet, we focus on forest positive strategies for commodities at high risk of deforestation and where we can make a meaningful impact; those high risk commodities are palm oil, cocoa and fiber (pulp and paper) packaging*

#### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

##### Environmental commitments

- Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

##### Forests-specific commitments

- Commitment to no development on peat regardless of depth
- Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat
- Commitment to no land clearance by burning or clearcutting
- Commitment to the use of the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach
- Commitment to no deforestation, to no planting on peatlands, and to no exploitation (NDPE) by target date, please specify :2025
- Commitment to no-conversion of natural ecosystems by target date, please specify :2025
- Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify :2025

##### Social commitments

- Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights
- Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

##### Additional references/Descriptions

- Description of commodities covered by the policy

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

*Select all that apply*

- Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

#### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- Publicly available

#### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

*No Deforestation Statement.pdf*

### Row 3

#### (4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Water

#### (4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

#### (4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

#### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*Since 2006, General Mills has had specific goals to reduce our water usage rate in our own facilities. We realize that the majority of the water required to bring our products to consumers is used upstream of our direct operations. General Mills has assessed that 99% of the water use associated with our value chain occurs upstream of our direct operations in agriculture and ingredient production (85%), and packaging (14%). For this reason, we have committed to advancing water stewardship plans for our most material and at-risk watersheds in our global value chain. Seven of our 10 priority watersheds represent a sourcing location for at least one ingredient. We are also exploring, through research and farmer pilots, regenerative agriculture as a means to improve water quality and quantity impact. improve water quality and quantity impact.*

#### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

#### Environmental commitments

- Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas
- Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues
- Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
- Commitment to engage in integrated, multi-stakeholder landscape (including river basin) initiatives to promote shared sustainability goals

#### Water-specific commitments

- Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
- Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes
- Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes
- Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems
- Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

#### Additional references/Descriptions

- Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation
- Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems
- Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

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

*Select all that apply*

- Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

### **(4.6.1.7) Public availability**

*Select from:*

- Publicly available

### **(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy**

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

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

Select from:

Yes

##### (4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

- RE100
- We Mean Business
- New York Declaration on Forests
- Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
- Consumer Goods Forum Forests Positive Coalition
- Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member
- Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

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

*We directly control only a small portion of our value chain, so driving transformation across the entire system requires leadership and collaboration with suppliers, farmers, ingredient and packaging producers, product transport providers, retailers and consumers. Combating climate change also requires collective action across industries and our broader society.*

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

- Paris Agreement
- Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

#### **(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement**

*General Mills Climate Policy.pdf*

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

*Select from:*

- Yes

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

*Select all that apply*

- Voluntary government register

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

General Mills is registered on the EU Transparency Register. Our registration number is 547515351604-74 House: <https://disclosurespreview.house.gov> Our House ID# is 314940000. Organization name is Senate <https://da.senate.gov/system/public/>, under the organization name "General Mills Services Inc.". Our Senate ID# is 16010-12

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

*As one of the world's largest food companies, General Mills plays an important role in the everyday lives of people around the world. One way we do this is by engaging in the public sphere, adding our voice to discussions on public policies to improve the lives of our consumers. We are committed to conducting these activities in an accountable and transparent manner. We articulate our policy priorities for the greater good on our website, which include: Protecting and Preserving our Agricultural Lands Ensuring Safe Food Delivering Nutrition Increasing Food Security and Strengthening Communities Informing Consumers and Increasing Awareness We comply with all lobbying regulations where applicable and file regular reports on our lobbying activity. General Mills is registered as a lobbying entity at the federal level for the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate and in Minnesota and California. Board oversight: The Public Responsibility Committee of our board of directors is made up of entirely outside directors that provides oversight over the company's political activity including: Review of company policy on political expenditures Review of corporate political contributions Review of major trade association memberships Approval of independent political expenditures (although the company has not made any)*  
[Fixed row]

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

##### **Row 1**

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

*Regenerative agriculture and soil health*

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

*Select all that apply*

- Climate change
- Water

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

- Emissions – CO2
- Water availability

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

*Select from:*

- National

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

*Select all that apply*

- United States of America

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

*Select from:*

- Support with no exceptions

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

*Select all that apply*

- Ad-hoc meetings
- Discussion in public forums

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

0

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

*General Mills is leading the charge on regenerative agriculture, investing to support farmers as they shift agriculture in North America towards more sustainable practices. Our Farm Bill 2023 priorities focus on supporting voluntary implementation of regenerative practices via federal conservation programs, partnerships, and technical assistance. We also support research to advance regenerative practices and a strong organic standard. We are strong supporters of the Foundation for Food and Ag Research (FFAR), a critical facilitator of public private partnerships between industry and farmers. We applauded the passage of the bipartisan Growing Climate Solutions Act of 2022 which will provide farmers with much-needed technical assistance to be able to participate in voluntary carbon markets. We helped establish the Ecosystem Service Market Consortium (ESMC) and Eco-Harvest, which quantifies the benefits of sustainable agricultural practices so farmers can be paid for providing them. We have supported state investments in the University of Minnesota Forever Green crop research initiative and Pheasants Forever's efforts to expand farmer access to technical assistance.*

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

*Select from:*

- Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

*Select all that apply*

- Paris Agreement
- Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

### **Row 2**

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

*Advancing water stewardship*

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

*Select all that apply*

- Water

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

- Water availability

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

Select from:

- National

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

Select all that apply

- United States of America

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

Select from:

- Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

- Ad-hoc meetings
- Discussion in public forums

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

0

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

*As a global food company, water is critical to our business. We take a broad approach to water stewardship, looking beyond our company's walls to the phases of our value chain that drive overall use. We also engage policy makers to drive more sustainable water practices. Examples include our membership in the California Water*

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

Select from:

- Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

- Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

**Row 3**

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

*Addressing packaging and food waste*

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change

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

Low-impact production and innovation

- Recycling and recyclability

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

Select from:

National

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

Select all that apply

United States of America

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

Select from:

Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

Ad-hoc meetings

Discussion in public forums

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

0

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

*General Mills promotes policies to increase packaging recycling rates and reduce food waste — including through our global packaging ambition. In the United States, we are a leader in AMERIPEN — the American Institute for Packaging and the Environment — which conducts research and advocates for policy changes at the state and federal level. In 2024, we joined aligned companies and trade associations in urging the passage of two bills, The Recycling Infrastructure Accessibility Act (RIAA), and the Recycling and Composting Accountability Act (RCAA), which would increase access to recycling services and improve tracking of recycled material. We are also a founding member of the Circular Action Alliance, a nonprofit organization approved to implement Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) laws in U.S. states. CAA aims to deliver best-in-class harmonized compliance services, scale, and innovation; and build systems that help both companies and consumers waste less and recycle more. General Mills signed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's America Recycles Pledge to build on our efforts and to identify solutions that create a more resilient materials economy and protect the environment. At the community level, General Mills' investment alongside others through the MBOLD Coalition brought a new recycling plant for flexible films and packaging materials to the Upper Midwest. General Mills and other supporting*

companies will evaluate how we can use its recycled materials in product applications. General Mills was named as a 2030 Food Waste and Loss Champion by the United States Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency and Food and Drug Administration. We support the nonprofit organization, ReFED (“Re-think Food Waste through Economics and Data”), which works to recover surplus food by aligning and mobilizing cross-sector coalitions. We are a founding partner with Feeding America. Recently, General Mills was Feeding America’s leading partner in developing their logistics network and Meal Connect, an app that connects local food banks to excess food. Our partnership includes food donations, promotional marketing, and local volunteerism. To date, we’ve been able to rescue over five billion pounds of food.

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

Select from:

- Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

#### **Row 1**

##### **(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement**

Select from:

- Indirect engagement via a trade association

##### **(4.11.2.4) Trade association**

North America

- Other trade association in North America, please specify :AMERIPEN

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

Select all that apply

Climate change

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

Select from:

Consistent

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

Select from:

Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

*As a leader in AMERIPEN, we are deeply engaged in their entire public policy strategy, including developing committee structure and consultant relationships, establishing coalition structure, recruiting members, and engaging daily on strategy execution. AMERIPEN is a recognized leader in the packaging policy space and has coordinated several engagements in key states.*

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

25000

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

*The funding figure provided is the annual membership dues paid during the reporting year.*

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

Select from:

- Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement

### Row 3

#### (4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

- Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

#### (4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

- Research organization

#### (4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

*Foundation for Food and Ag Research*

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Water

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

Select from:

Consistent

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

Select from:

Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

*General Mills is a leading voice on regenerative agriculture. We invest to help support farmers as they shift toward more sustainable practices and encourage collaboration and investment by governments and the private sector, such as our support for the Foundation for Food and Ag Research (FFAR), a critical facilitator of public private partnerships between industry and farmers and academic research.*

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

32500

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

*One area of FFAR that we support is the FFAR Fellows program where we contribute about 32,500 per year to support PhD students and their research. This figure does not represent our total funding of regenerative agriculture advocacy, but is an illustrative example of how our company is engaging to advance research in this space.*

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

Select from:

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement
- Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

[Add row]

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

#### Row 1

### (4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

- In voluntary sustainability reports

### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water
- Biodiversity

#### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

- Complete

#### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- Strategy
- Governance
- Emission targets
- Emissions figures
- Value chain engagement
- Public policy engagement
- Content of environmental policies
- Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics
- Other, please specify :**Other metrics**

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

*Planet section, pages 31 - 59*

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*general-mills-global-responsibility-report.pdf*

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*2025 (Fiscal 2024 data) Global Responsibility Report*

### Row 2

#### (4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

- In mainstream reports

#### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

Climate change

#### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

Complete

#### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

Risks & Opportunities

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

*Risk factors, pages 8-12*

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*2024 Annual Report.pdf*

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*Fiscal 2024 Annual Report*

### Row 3

#### (4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

In voluntary sustainability reports

#### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

- Climate change

#### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

- Complete

#### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- Governance
- Strategy
- Value chain engagement
- Emissions figures
- Emission targets

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

*Climate Transition Action Plan - all pages*

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*Climate Transition Action Plan.pdf*

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*Fiscal 2024 Climate Transition Action Plan Update*

### Row 4

#### (4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

- In mainstream reports

### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

Climate change

### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

Complete

### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

Governance

Emission targets

### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

*Climate and sustainability targets: pages 8-9 Governance: page 32*

### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*2024 proxy statement.pdf*

### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*fiscal 2024 proxy report*

*[Add row]*

## C5. Business strategy

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

### Climate change

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Every two years

### Forests

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Every two years

### Water

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

## (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Every three years or less frequently

[Fixed row]

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

### Climate change

#### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Current Policies, Net Zero 2050 and Delayed Transition.

#### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

#### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

Acute physical

Chronic physical

- Policy
- Market

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 1.5°C or lower

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

- Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

- On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

- Globalizing markets

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Please note: While we are undergoing an updated climate and nature risk assessment to prepare for upcoming regulatory requirements, the results of those are not yet final and therefore cannot be disclosed at this time. Therefore the details provided here are from our last scenario analysis. The scenarios are hypothetical constructs that depict a set of different plausible climate-related futures that will impact the operating context of business. Although grounded in NGFS\* data, the scenarios are not intended to predict a single “most likely” future. Rather, they offer a complementary approach to forecasting, one that enables the exploration of highly uncertain future possibilities. These scenarios use broad descriptions to holistically describe plausible futures based on the available climate data. Not all topics are included in each decade of each scenario. Instead, the scenarios highlight the defining topics and developments in each decade.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*General Mills partnered with a global nonprofit to explore the strategic implications for General Mills under three scenarios for 2050 and update the scenario analysis presented in the previous years. The scenario analysis process involved the following steps: • Scenario Development: Used three climate scenarios developed by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS): Net Zero 2050, Delayed Transition, and Current Policies. The NGFS scenarios were developed to provide a common starting point for analyzing climate risks to the economy and financial system. They represent a global, harmonized set of transition pathways, physical climate impacts, and economic indicators. These climate scenarios provide the base narratives for General Mills' climate scenario analysis. The narratives were extended by adding content about how a range of business-relevant topics might plausibly play out in each of these scenarios.*

## Forests

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Current Policies, Net Zero 2050 and Delayed Transition. (Specific to Land Use Change)

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

*Select all that apply*

- Acute physical
- Chronic physical
- Policy
- Market

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

- 1.5°C or lower

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

- 2030
- 2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

- Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

Globalizing markets

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Please note: While we are undergoing an updated climate and nature risk assessment to prepare for upcoming regulatory requirements, the results of those are not yet final and therefore cannot be disclosed at this time. Therefore the details provided here are from our last scenario analysis. The scenarios are hypothetical constructs that depict a set of different plausible climate-related futures that will impact the operating context of business. Although grounded in NGFS\* data, the scenarios are not intended to predict a single “most likely” future. Rather, they offer a complementary approach to forecasting, one that enables the exploration of highly uncertain future possibilities. These scenarios use broad descriptions to holistically describe plausible futures based on the available climate data. Not all topics are included in each decade of each scenario. Instead, the scenarios highlight the defining topics and developments in each decade.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*General Mills partnered with a global nonprofit to explore the strategic implications for General Mills under three scenarios for 2050 and update the scenario analysis presented in the previous years. The scenario analysis process involved the following steps: • Scenario Development: Used three climate scenarios developed by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS): Net Zero 2050, Delayed Transition, and Current Policies. The NGFS scenarios were developed to provide a common starting point for analyzing climate risks to the economy and financial system. They represent a global, harmonized set of transition pathways, physical climate impacts, and economic indicators. These climate scenarios provide the base narratives for General Mills' climate scenario analysis. The narratives were extended by adding content about how a range of business-relevant topics might plausibly play out in each of these scenarios.*

## Water

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

WWF Water Risk Filter

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

#### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

#### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Acute physical
- Chronic physical
- Policy
- Reputation

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2030
- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Changes to the state of nature
- Number of ecosystems impacted
- Changes in ecosystem services provision
- Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Stakeholder and customer demands

Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

Global regulation

Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts, which includes scenario analysis. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment uses aggregated scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. WWF Water Risk filter includes physical risk, regulatory risk, and reputational risk. The physical risk layer has multiple SSP options (SSP1, SSP2 and SSP3); to get insight into risk in a "business as usual" world, we assumed that current trends would continue and therefore used the "current view" layer to assesses risk in a world with current socio-economic development trends (SSP2) and intermediate GHG emission levels (RCP4.5 /RCP6.0) (2°C scenario). The physical risk layer comprises four risk categories: water scarcity, flooding, water quality, and ecosystem services status. An example assumption in the water impact assessment for all scenarios is that only dams of status "under construction" end up operating and therefore negatively impacting connectivity of free-flowing rivers. The primary uncertainty in this assessment is which of the scenarios will take place; therefore we chose the "current view". See "Water Risk Filter Methodology" for additional details on assumptions, uncertainties and constraints: [https://cdn.kettufy.io/prod-fra-1.kettufy.io/documents/riskfilter.org/WaterRiskFilter\\_Methodology.pdf](https://cdn.kettufy.io/prod-fra-1.kettufy.io/documents/riskfilter.org/WaterRiskFilter_Methodology.pdf)*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*Given our inability to predict the future and to balance optimism and pessimism, we have assumed that current trends will continue. To get insight into this potential future, we have therefore selected the "current view" layer in WWF Water Risk Filter layer to assesses water risk in a world with current socio-economic development trends (SSP2) and intermediate GHG emission levels (RCP4.5 /RCP6.0) (2°C scenario).*

*[Add row]*

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

### Climate change

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

*Select all that apply*

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- Strategy and financial planning
- Resilience of business model and strategy
- Capacity building
- Target setting and transition planning

### (5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- Organization-wide

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

*The initial outcomes of the scenario analysis helped to inform and reinforce the key levers of our target setting and transition planning. The scenario analysis identified the priority climate risks and opportunities that will need to be included in our short-, medium-, and long-term strategy. The results of this analysis led to the initiation of further assessment of the risks, including a financial assessment, as well as further integration of findings within the organization, such as ERM, and ensuring risks are appropriately managed within each climate target.*

## Forests

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

Select all that apply

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- Strategy and financial planning
- Resilience of business model and strategy
- Capacity building
- Target setting and transition planning

### (5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- Organization-wide

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

*The initial outcomes of the scenario analysis helped to inform and reinforce the key levers of our target setting and transition planning, including Forest Positive strategies to reduce land use change-related emissions. The scenario analysis identified the priority climate risks and opportunities that will need to be included in our short-, medium-, and long-term strategy, including eliminating deforestation and advancing forest positive strategies. The results of this analysis led to the initiation of further assessment of the risks, including a financial assessment, as well as further integration of findings within the organization.*

## Water

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

*Select all that apply*

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- Strategy and financial planning
- Capacity building

### (5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

*Select from:*

- Organization-wide

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

*As a result of our water scenario analysis, we made the decision to complete validating water-related risks and opportunities in 2023, which in turn helped to inform and reinforce the key levers of our climate transition plan. The next phase of our work will entail further assessment of the risks, integration of findings within the organization and ensuring risks are appropriately managed. Next steps include: Validation of water related risks and opportunities; Assessment of impact and materiality; Identification of strategic interventions; Integration into business processes and risk management; Reporting of findings and actions in subsequent disclosures. Water risk will be a component of our climate risk integration and disclosure process, as water risk is a primary way that climate change impacts General Mills as a food company.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### (5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

### (5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

- Yes

### (5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:

- No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

### (5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

*We consider all activities that contribute to GHG emissions in developing our climate plan and are focused on the areas where we can have the greatest impact. While we do not explicitly commit to elimination of fossil fuels, we aim to reduce them in alignment with our plan.*

### (5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

- We have a different feedback mechanism in place

### (5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

*Stakeholder engagement facilitated by a third party to bring together different types of stakeholders (investors, NGOs, peers) to review and provide feedback on climate plan.*

### (5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

- Less frequently than annually

#### (5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

*To address the increasing importance of communicating transparently and openly with our stakeholders on climate, we released our first Climate Transition Action Plan. While our strategies will continue to evolve, this report represents where we are at a single point in time, and should not be seen as a static plan or guarantee of results. Rather it should be viewed as a step toward promoting transparency, productive dialogue and cross-industry collaboration. We are sharing insights into our priorities and actions, as well as our challenges, which we believe are important to drive collective action and progress. We are continuously learning and evolving in our climate journey and we still have work to do. We commit to providing updates on our progress and strategies on an annual basis.*

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

*As reported in our Climate Transition Action plan, in fiscal 2024 we reported a 19% decrease in total emissions vs our 2020 baseline.*

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

*Climate Transition Action Plan.pdf*

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

*Select all that apply*

- Forests
- Water
- Biodiversity

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

*We believe in the interlinkages of environmental issues including climate, forests, water, and biodiversity. In our climate transition plan, we are considering how climate change and other issues affect each other. For example, eliminating deforestation and preserving natural ecosystems are essential to meeting our climate commitment. To drive positive outcomes for both people and planet, we are focused on forest-positive strategies for commodities at high risk of deforestation and where we can make a meaningful impact and have a commitment to no deforestation in our palm, cocoa and fiber supply chains by 2025.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

	<b>Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition</b>
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

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

1

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

1

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

0

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

0

**(5.9.5) Please explain**

*Our water-related CAPEX has generally remained the same as our operations are currently stabilized, so we have selected 1% for the current year and anticipated trend. When they do occur, water-related expenditures can include expenditures for managing wastewater and address water quality issues. For example, our Arras*

117 ice cream plant has a goal to reduce water consumption by 3% annually, to reach a total of 10% reduction by our FY27 from a 2019-2022 average water consumption baseline. The plant has installed a water re-use station, is working on a project to reduce line sanitation water and will install water meters in FY25 to improve employee process ownership and continuous improvement at the line level. They have invested a total of 1.5 million and anticipate a further investment of 130,000. We do not anticipate significant impact on our OPEX, as water is very cheap so water reduction has no positive economic impact. Therefore, we have selected 0 as the current and future trend.

[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to in the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not an immediate strategic priority	<i>Currently, we use other mechanisms to fund greenhouse gas reduction projects.</i>

[Fixed row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Smallholders	<i>Select from:</i>	<i>Select all that apply</i>

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Customers	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Investors and shareholders	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change
Other value chain stakeholders	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change

[Fixed row]

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

#### Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions
- Dependence on commodities

### (5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

76-99%

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

*Our Scope 3 GHG inventory calculation leverages primary activity-based data reports pulled from functions across the organization, in addition to scaling factors as needed. The majority of cradle-to-gate emission factors used to calculate our Scope 3 footprint are sourced from the World Food Lifecycle Database and ecoinvent. Continually working to improve the accuracy of our GHG emissions calculation, we also leverage custom-developed, supplier-specific and supply shed specific emission factors*

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

150

## Forests

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

### (5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

100%

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

*As part of our effort to advance progress and aligned with sector best practice, General Mills uses the No Deforestation, No Peat, and No Exploitation Implementation Reporting Framework (NDPE-IRF)—a reporting tool designed to help companies understand and track progress in delivering palm sustainability targets, including deforestation-free supply chains.*

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

Select from:

Unknown

## Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

Dependence on water

Dependence on commodities

Impact on water availability

### (5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

1-25%

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

*Every year including the reporting year of fiscal year 2023, through our annual responsible sourcing audit process, we request suppliers to provide information about water volume used, water volume discharged, and water volume recycled. At this time, we review and monitor those responses, however there is no defined threshold for classifying our suppliers as having a substantive dependency and/or impact related to water.*

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

*Select from:*

Unknown

*[Fixed row]*

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

#### **Climate change**

#### **(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

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

*Select all that apply*

Material sourcing

Procurement spend

Regulatory compliance

Reputation management

Business risk mitigation

Product safety and compliance

- Supplier performance improvement
- In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*For suppliers who have yet to prioritize climate action, this is commonly due to lack of resources available to prioritize the issue, do the early work to understand and track emissions, respond to surveys and vet potential decarbonization solutions. General Mills has worked to provide technical resources through the Supplier Leadership on Carbon Transition (SLoCT) to overcome this barrier. For a small amount of suppliers, they have not prioritized this issue as important or material for their business.*

### Forests

#### (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

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

Select all that apply

- In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to forests
- Procurement spend

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*For suppliers who have yet to prioritize environmental issues, this is commonly due to lack of resources available to prioritize the issue, do the early work to understand and track current state, respond to surveys and vet potential solutions.. For a small amount of suppliers, they have not prioritized this issue as important or material for their business*

### Water

#### (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

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

Select all that apply

- Business risk mitigation
- Material sourcing
- Other, please specify :Supplier maturity on water risk assessment and mitigation

### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*We prioritize which suppliers to engage with on water risk based on which ingredients they supply to General Mills and whether they are located within one of our priority watersheds. For example, we have prioritized the San Joaquin Valley, California, as one of our priority watersheds and almonds as one of our priority ingredients. We strategically engage with some of our almond suppliers to assess their maturity on water risk assessment and mitigation and to explore potential collaborations through mutual partnership with NGOs on almond and water research and program implementation.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

#### Climate change

### (5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

- Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

### (5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

- Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

### (5.11.5.3) Comment

*At General Mills, we are responsible for maintaining high standards in our own operations and across our value chain. Through our Global Responsible Sourcing program, we uphold our Supplier Code of Conduct and drive ongoing supplier progress in the areas of health and safety, human rights, business integrity and the*

environment. This increases our influence to protect and respect the people who supply, transform and manufacture the goods and services we use to make our products. In addition to complying with all applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing greenhouse gas emissions reduction initiatives, reducing, or optimizing the use of water, energy, and agriculture inputs, and minimizing water pollution and waste. General Mills may require suppliers to provide information regarding environmental standards and metrics & measures, such as Scope 1-3 greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy usage. Through our Responsible Sourcing program, we seek to close out noncompliances. When a supplier does not comply with a standard set in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we partner with the supplier to provide resources or training as needed to address the noncompliance. If a resolution cannot be reached, the decision is escalated to leadership through our Business Performance Management process for final resolution and alignment.

## Forests

### (5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

### (5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

### (5.11.5.3) Comment

At General Mills, we are responsible for maintaining high standards in our own operations and across our value chain. Through our Global Responsible Sourcing program, we uphold our Supplier Code of Conduct and drive ongoing supplier progress in the areas of health and safety, human rights, business integrity and the environment. This increases our influence to protect and respect the people who supply, transform and manufacture the goods and services we use to make our products. In addition to complying with all applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing greenhouse gas emissions reduction initiatives, reducing, or optimizing the use of water, energy, and agriculture inputs, and minimizing water pollution and waste. General Mills may require suppliers to provide information regarding environmental standards and metrics & measures, such as Scope 1-3 greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy usage. Through our Responsible Sourcing program, we seek to close out noncompliances. When a supplier does not comply with a standard set in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we partner with the supplier to provide resources or training as needed to address the noncompliance. If a resolution cannot be reached, the decision is escalated to leadership through our Business Performance Management process for final resolution and alignment.

## Water

### **(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process**

Select from:

- Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

### **(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance**

Select from:

- Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

### **(5.11.5.3) Comment**

*At General Mills, we are responsible for maintaining high standards in our own operations and across our value chain. Through our Global Responsible Sourcing program, we uphold our Supplier Code of Conduct and drive ongoing supplier progress in the areas of health and safety, human rights, business integrity and the environment. This increases our influence to protect and respect the people who supply, transform and manufacture the goods and services we use to make our products. In addition to complying with all applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing greenhouse gas emissions reduction initiatives, reducing, or optimizing the use of water, energy, and agriculture inputs, and minimizing water pollution and waste. General Mills may require suppliers to provide information regarding environmental standards and metrics & measures, such requirements for water access, sanitation and hygiene facilities for supplier employees. Through our Responsible Sourcing program, we seek to close out noncompliances. When a supplier does not comply with a standard set in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we partner with the supplier to provide resources or training to address the noncompliance. If a resolution cannot be reached, the decision is escalated to leadership through our Business Performance Management process for final resolution.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

#### **Climate change**

### **(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement**

Select from:

- Disclosure of GHG emissions to your organization (Scope 1, 2 and 3)

### **(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement**

*Select all that apply*

- Supplier scorecard or rating
- Supplier self-assessment
- Other, please specify :Suppliers can provide third-party verification

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

*Select from:*

- 26-50%

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

*Select from:*

- 1-25%

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

*Select from:*

- 51-75%

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

*Select from:*

- 26-50%

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

*Select from:*

- Retain and engage

### (5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

- 100%

### (5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*At General Mills, we are responsible for maintaining high standards in our own operations and across our value chain. Through our Global Responsible Sourcing program, we uphold our Supplier Code of Conduct and drive ongoing supplier progress in the areas of health and safety, human rights, business integrity and the environment. This increases our influence to protect and respect the people who supply, transform and manufacture the goods and services we use to make our products. In addition to complying with all applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing greenhouse gas emissions reduction initiatives, reducing, or optimizing the use of water, energy, and agriculture inputs, and minimizing water pollution and waste. General Mills may require suppliers to provide information regarding environmental standards and metrics & measures, such as Scope 1-3 greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy usage. Through our Responsible Sourcing program, we seek to close out noncompliances. When a supplier does not comply with a standard set in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we partner with the supplier to provide resources or training as needed to address the noncompliance. If a resolution cannot be reached, the decision is escalated to leadership through our Business Performance Management process for final resolution and alignment.*

## Forests

### (5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- No deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- Certification
- Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline
- Supplier scorecard or rating
- Supplier self-assessment

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

*Select from:*

- 100%

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

*Select from:*

- 76-99%

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

*Select from:*

- Retain and engage

#### **(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged**

*Select from:*

- 100%

#### **(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers**

*Select all that apply*

- Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

#### **(5.11.6.12) Comment**

*We ensure suppliers have deforestation monitoring programs through our partnership with Proforest, who conducts regular supplier risk assessments across all suppliers. In addition, we have an internal grievance process and publicly available tracker in place to monitor any producer-related grievances with alleged cases of non-compliance against our policy and have a management system in place to set up implementation plans to track suppliers' performance. Depending on the severity of suppliers' non-compliance with our NPDE commitment, General Mills may implement either engage directly with suppliers through corrective action and implementation plans or in extreme cases, cease existing contracts with suppliers.*

## **Water**

### **(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement**

*Select from:*

- Provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all employees

### **(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement**

*Select all that apply*

- First-party verification
- Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline
- On-site third-party audit
- Supplier self-assessment

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

*Select from:*

- 100%

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

*Select from:*

- 76-99%

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

*Select from:*

- Retain and engage

### (5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

100%

### (5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

- Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics
- Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
- Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance
- Re-integrating suppliers back into upstream value chain based on the successful and verifiable completion of activities

### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*At General Mills, we are responsible for maintaining high standards in our own operations and across our value chain. Through our Global Responsible Sourcing program, we uphold our Supplier Code of Conduct and drive ongoing supplier progress in the areas of health and safety, human rights, business integrity and the environment. This increases our influence to protect and respect the people who supply, transform and manufacture the goods and services we use to make our products. In addition to complying with all applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing greenhouse gas emissions reduction initiatives, reducing, or optimizing the use of water, energy, and agriculture inputs, and minimizing water pollution and waste. General Mills may require suppliers to provide information regarding environmental standards and metrics & measures, such as Scope 1-3 greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy usage. Through our Responsible Sourcing program, we seek to close out noncompliances. When a supplier does not comply with a standard set in our Supplier Code of Conduct, we partner with the supplier to provide resources or training as needed to address the noncompliance. If a resolution cannot be reached, the decision is escalated to leadership through our Business Performance Management process for final resolution and alignment.*

[Add row]

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

### Climate change

#### (5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- Emissions reduction

### (5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

#### Capacity building

- Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions
- Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact
- Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets
- Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones
- Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

#### Information collection

- Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
- Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

#### Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
- Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

*Select all that apply*

- Tier 1 suppliers

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

*Select from:*

- 26-50%

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

*Select from:*

- 51-75%

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

*General Mills measures success of its supplier engagement by its annual value chain emissions reductions. By 2030, General Mills is committed to reduce value chain emissions by 30% (compared to 2020). We have identified several key levers to help us achieve our climate commitment and we are actively collaborating across our value chain to drive change to meet our climate goals. We have identified several key levers to help us achieve our commitments and we are actively building strategies with shared goals, vision and theory of change to drive progress in these areas. Examples of key climate levers include agriculture & ingredients, energy, packaging, and transportation. Through fiscal 2023 we have reduced our scopes 1, 2, and 3 emissions including a 7% reduction across the entire value chain compared to 2020 baseline*

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

Select from:

Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :In addition to complying with applicable environmental laws, we expect suppliers to continually improve their own environmental performance, including, but not limited to, measuring, setting reduction targets, and implementing reduction initiatives.

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

Select from:

Yes

## **Forests**

### **(5.11.7.1) Commodity**

Select from:

Palm oil

### **(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement**

Select from:

No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

### **(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement**

#### Capacity building

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

#### Financial incentives

- Pay higher prices linked to best agricultural practices

#### Information collection

- Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers
- Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
- Collect WASH information at least annually from suppliers
- Other information collection activity, please specify :collect NDPE-IRF profiles annually.

#### Innovation and collaboration

- Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

*Select all that apply*

- Tier 1 suppliers
- Tier 2 suppliers

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

*Select from:*

- 100%

### (5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

1

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

*We define success as reaching 75% or more of our Tier 1 suppliers in key supplier engagement initiatives. For example: we engage 100% of our Tier 1 palm oil suppliers to source RSPO certified volumes at a premium price. 100% of our Tier 1 palm oil suppliers provide us with their NDPE-IRF profiles and global mills lists on*

an annual basis, which provide us with environmental risk and opportunity information. 78% of Tier 1 palm oil suppliers, who collectively supply 83% of volumes are supporting initiatives delivering forest positive development at landscape and/or sectoral level. As a member of the Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition Palm Oil Working Group, we support the recent development and introduction of the Monitoring and Response Framework (MRF). As a result, to enhance alignment with procedures established and agreed by the sector, we have adapted our grievance management process to embed the MRF key steps when handling deforestation non-compliances. In this reporting year, 78% of Tier 1 palm oil suppliers, who collectively supply 83% of volumes, engage regularly with General Mills related to upstream grievances through our grievance management process and MRF, including monitoring and reporting on corrective action progress. We consider this a success. We also partner directly with one Tier 2 supplier, Musim Mas, to support a landscape initiative in Aceh Singkil, Indonesia. Since 2020, General Mills has partnered with Musim Mas to support the Smallholder Hub program. This program designed to integrate independent smallholders from villages in Aceh Singkil, Indonesia, into the sustainable palm oil supply chain, and reduce deforestation by building capacity and improving livelihoods. We are pleased to partner with Musim Mas focused on improving the economic security of smallholders and assisting them on their journey towards sustainable production.

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

Select from:

Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :DCF palm measured in NDPE- IRF

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

Select from:

Yes

### **Water**

#### **(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement**

Select from:

Adaptation to climate change

#### **(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement**

Capacity building

- Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions
- Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets
- Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

#### Information collection

- Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers
- Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
- Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers
- Collect WASH information at least annually from suppliers

#### Innovation and collaboration

- Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions
- Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify :whole farm GHG modeling for dairy

### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers
- Tier 4+ suppliers

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

Select from:

- 100%

### (5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

1

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

*Regenerative agriculture (RA) is our primary strategy for supplier and farmer engagement on water and collaboration in key ingredient supplysheds such as California (almonds and >50 additional ingredients), the Northern Plains of Canada and the US (oats), Southern Plains of the US (wheat), the Red River Valley (sugar), and the Great Lakes (dairy), Indonesia (palm), and Mexico (sugar and strawberries). Success of our supplyshed engagement is measured by progress toward our commitment to advance RA on 1 million acres by 2030. For example, in California, our engagement on RA helps reduce negative agricultural impacts on water quality and quantity, helping protect and restore clean groundwater. Lärabar, a General Mills brand, funded three years of research with the Ecdysis Foundation in CA's San Joaquin Valley to determine how on-farm practices are linked to regenerative outcomes for water, soil health, crop yield and more. In F23, General Mills launched*

*Larabar Trail Mix Bars. More than half of the almonds included in each bar are grown using RA practices. General Mills funds research with UC Davis on water balance in almond orchards to understand whether regenerative orchards use less water than conventional ones. Early results show growing almonds with RA principles improves soil health and increases water infiltration rates, which could reduce irrigation and increase water resilience to drought and flood. General Mills funds farmer educational training and 1:1 coaching in RA principles and practices associated with water outcomes: economic resiliency in farming communities, soil health, water, biodiversity, and cow and herd well-being (dairy operations). We engage suppliers in these programs to identify farmers interested in participating. Being part of our direct supply chain is not a requirement to participate. We aim to extend positive impact beyond our direct supply chain; General Mills takes a supplyshd approach to farmer engagement. Any farmer within the RA program's region is eligible to participate and receive benefits, regardless of current sales relationship. RA helps maximize water use efficiency in rain-fed and irrigated systems. These practices can reduce agriculture's impact on water quality, helping to protect and restore clean water. Therefore, we engage a portion of our suppliers in key growing regions on RA, where we have potential to address water risk and/or scale positive water impact.*

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

Select from:

Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :no deforestation

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

Select from:

Yes

[Add row]

## **(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity**

### **Row 1**

#### **(5.11.8.1) Commodity**

Select from:

Palm oil

#### **(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach**

## Capacity building

- Disseminate technical materials
- Organize capacity building events
- Offer on-site technical assistance and extension services
- Support smallholders to adhere to standards in upstream value chain
- Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity
- Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management
- Prioritize support for smallholders in regions at high-risk of deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems

### (5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

1500

### (5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*General Mills partners with Musim Mas to engage and train smallholder farmers in six priority villages in Aceh Singkil, Indonesia. The program supports smallholder farmers via No Deforestation, Peat and No Exploitation-Randomized Controlled Trial (NPDE-RCT) program; engage and train Smallholders in Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) The NDPE-RCT training program consists of three components: (1) GAP, which encompasses plantation maintenance, fertilizing, harvesting, and pest and disease control; (2) Financial literacy; and (3) No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation (NDPE) principles. Training provided to smallholders facilitates the gradual adoption and implementation of GAP, including agronomic skills such as proper frond stacking, application of empty fruit bunches (EFB), and good pruning. Adoption rates of GAPs are monitored as measures of success. Where adoption rates remain low, field assistants are committed to offering continued assistance to boost GAP implementation. We consider the engagement successful when the 2023 goals have progress or are met/exceeded and consider 2023 a successful year.*

## Row 2

### (5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

- Cocoa

### (5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

## Capacity building

- Disseminate technical materials

- Organize capacity building events
- Offer on-site technical assistance and extension services
- Support smallholders to clarify and secure land tenure rights
- Support smallholders to adopt best practices which protect biodiversity
- Provide training, support and best practices on sustainable agriculture practices and nutrient management
- Prioritize support for smallholders in regions at high-risk of deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems

### (5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

3500

### (5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*General Mills has partnered with CARE International to develop the Cocoa Sustainability Initiative, a livelihoods and gender equity project focused on smallholder cocoa farmers and their families in West Africa. Among other interventions, CARE trains cocoa farmers on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) such as nursery establishment, pruning, use of improved seeds, and fertilizer application. CARE conducts a baseline and endline study to measure GAP adoption rates. In Ghana, the overall GAP adoption rate at the end of the endline study was 88.6%, with an increase in the proportion of farmers practicing at least three GAPs.*  
 [Add row]

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

#### Climate change

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Customers

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

#### Innovation and collaboration

- Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions
- Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan
- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
- Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

### (5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

- 26-50%

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

*We engage our customers in this work to invite the full value chain to contribute to solutions like Regenerative Agriculture and a circular economy. We were a part of a water session in Arkansas with The Nature Conservancy and Walmart on Rice. We have since made a commitment to continue to ensure that 100% of the equivalent acres of the rice we procure from Arkansas and the Mississippi River Delta Region is grown with at least one water efficient practice that reduces groundwater use, such as irrigation times by 2024*

### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*Shared partnerships across the value chain to advance regenerative agriculture and build understanding of the work to be done. For example, in October 2023, during our reporting year of fiscal year 2023, General Mills, Walmart and Sam's Club announced a collaboration to help accelerate the adoption of regenerative agriculture on 600,000 acres in the U.S. by 2030. This represents the approximate number of acres General Mills engages to source key ingredients for its products sold through Walmart and Sam's Club. Initial projects will be supported through grants administered by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), building out the education and coaching resources needed to help accelerate regenerative agriculture. The collaboration will help support the transition to regenerative agriculture production in the U.S. by: supporting capacity and programming for local organizations on the ground; connecting farmers to financial resources to help*

implement new practices; elevating the potential for more resilient yields for farmers through efforts to improve soil health, watersheds, biodiversity, climate change and farmer economic resilience; and helping ensure both companies can offer quality products to consumers long-term.

## Water

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Customers

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Incentivize collaborative sustainable water management in river basins

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 1-25%

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

*We engage policymakers in our efforts to advance water stewardship and regenerative agriculture because supportive policies can incent change in our value chain and Scope 3 emissions footprint more effectively than we can through direct action. For water stewardship, involvement of local officials can be part of achieving a robust cross-sector response.*

### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*Shared partnerships across the value chain to advance regenerative agriculture and build understanding of the work to be done. For example, in October 2023, during our reporting year of fiscal year 2023, General Mills, Walmart and Sam's Club announced a collaboration to help accelerate the adoption of regenerative agriculture on 600,000 acres in the U.S. by 2030. This represents the approximate number of acres General Mills engages to source key ingredients for its products*

*sold through Walmart and Sam's Club. Initial projects will be supported through grants administered by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), building out the education and coaching resources needed to help accelerate regenerative agriculture. The collaboration will help support the transition to regenerative agriculture production in the U.S. by: supporting capacity and programming for local organizations on the ground; connecting farmers to financial resources to help implement new practices; elevating the potential for more resilient yields for farmers through efforts to improve soil health, watersheds, biodiversity, climate change and farmer economic resilience; and helping ensure both companies can offer quality products to consumers long-term.*

## Climate change

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Policymakers / government officials

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 1-25%

### (5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

- Less than 1%

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

*We engage policymakers in our efforts to advance water stewardship and regenerative agriculture because supportive policies can incent change in our value chain and Scope 3 emissions footprint more effectively than we can through direct action. For water stewardship, involvement of local officials can be part of achieving a robust cross-sector response.*

### **(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success**

*One goal of our engagement with policymakers and government officials is federal funding for voluntary programs that farmers can use to advance regenerative practices and water stewardship plans and projects in specific priority watersheds. Additionally, we also engage policy makers to drive more sustainable water practices. Examples include our membership in the California Water Action Collaborative, a platform for diverse stakeholders to pursue projects to improve water security in California for people, business, agriculture and nature, and Connect the Drops, which educates California lawmakers about such efforts and advocates for policy solutions.*

## **Climate change**

### **(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder**

Select from:

- Investors and shareholders

### **(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement**

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

### **(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged**

Select from:

- 1-25%

#### (5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

None

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

*While there are no Scope 3 emissions associated with our engagement with Investors and shareholders, at General Mills, we engage with stakeholders such as Investors & shareholders to accelerate progress on social and environmental initiatives. Our approach includes open dialogue, collaboration and transparent disclosure. This strengthens our ability to balance business and societal interests; build robust relationships globally across sectors; and ultimately, identify innovative solutions that create shared, sustainable value. We are working to address shared issues — including climate change and water stewardship — so collaboration is essential to achieving long-term, enduring progress. We work with other companies and organizations including Investors & Shareholders to shape standards across the consumer packaged goods industry, which elevates overall sector performance. We engage on issues that are material to our global responsibility strategy and where we can have a substantial positive impact. When engaging with stakeholders such as Investors & Shareholders, we assess potential alignment on objectives, organizational expertise, capacity, influence and willingness to collaborate.*

#### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*For the last several years, General Mills has engaged Ceres to convene a group of external stakeholders, including investors, NGO representatives and corporate practitioners, to provide input on our annual Global Responsibility Report. We value this input and have incorporated much of their feedback into the report. Additionally, we communicate to our investors on ESG-related topics through a variety of disclosures, including our Global Responsibility Report, Proxy Report and CDP. We also engage on a broad array of sustainability topics through events like regenerative farm visits and ESG investor calls. (investor calls is our # 1 way of communicating). Our goal is to communicate to our investors annually through our Global Responsibility Report, Proxy Report and CDP which we achieved in fiscal year 2023 and would consider this a success.*

*[Add row]*

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify :Other mechanisms to engage on initiatives with strategic partners	<i>We have implemented environmental initiatives with strategic partners and customers, just not as a result of CDP Supply Chain specifically.</i>

[Fixed row]

## C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

#### Climate change

##### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

##### (6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

*The organizational boundary for the General Mills corporate footprint was selected using the OPERATIONAL CONTROL APPROACH. Operational control is defined as having full authority to introduce and implement site-specific operating policies at the particular asset or organization, such as improvements regarding GHG emission reduction. Under this approach, General Mills takes responsibility for the Scope 1 & 2 emissions resulting from owned or leased assets or facilities that it has control over. The Scope 1 & 2 boundary includes emissions from General Mills-owned vehicles, its administrative activities, and the manufacturing activities of all fully integrated subsidiaries. To determine whether General Mills has operational control over an asset or organization, the Climate team will consult with the Corporate Accounting & Controls team, as well as any other relevant stakeholders*

#### Forests

##### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

##### (6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

*We are disclosing information regarding our palm supply chain with our Tier 1 suppliers; external supply chain (contract manufacturing) have been excluded. However, the greatest areas of environmental impact occur at the production level (TTP), to which we have 85% visibility through our supplier engagement program. Though we do not report on palm production outside the boundaries of the company, we collaborate with suppliers and partners to drive change at origin the integrate smallholder farmers in Indonesia into the sustainable palm oil supply chain to reduce deforestation by improving livelihoods. Those activities are reflected in the report, for example within responses related to ingredient sourcing, supplier management and risk mitigation.*

## Water

### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

### (6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

*We are reporting water use (i.e. withdrawal, discharge and consumption) only on companies, entities or groups over which operational control is exercised. Therefore, external supply chain (contract manufacturing) and ingredient supplier facilities have been excluded. However, the greatest areas of environmental impact (including 98% of water withdrawal) occur in our upstream supply chain, outside General Mills' operational control. Though we do not report exact usage data outside the boundaries of the company, we collaborate with suppliers and partners to drive change by promoting environmentally and socially responsible water practices across our value chain. Those activities are reflected in the report, for example within responses related to ingredient sourcing, supplier management and risk mitigation.*

## Plastics

### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

### (6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

*Not reporting as standalone at this time within CDP.*

## Biodiversity

### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

### (6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

*Considered as part of broader work on nature, such as regenerative agriculture, climate and water. Not reporting as standalone in CP.*  
*[Fixed row]*

## C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:

No

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

#### (7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply

Yes, other structural change, please specify

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

*In Fiscal Year 2024 Tyson treats plant sold, moving production to ESC. Independence will no longer run GMI products.*

#### (7.1.1.3) Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

*In Fiscal Year 2024, the Tyson treats plant was sold on November 30, 2023, with production moving to ESC, and Independence will no longer manufacture General Mills (GMI) products.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### (7.1.2.1) Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?

Select all that apply

- Yes, a change in methodology

### (7.1.2.2) Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)

*For Fiscal Year 2024 reporting, General Mills leveraged its new "sustainability data lake" to streamline GHG activity data collection for Scope 1 & 2 emissions. This replaced manual data gathering and Excel-based processing with an automated system for data collection, transformation, and export. Regrow, the data provider, implemented methodological changes that impacted emission factor calculations. These included stricter classifications for tillage practices, aligning with USDA and NRCS definitions, which resulted in increased reporting of conventional tillage areas. Updates to the DNDC model also revised nitrogen and carbon emission modeling. These changes led to more accurate and conservative, but higher, emissions estimates, particularly for N<sub>2</sub>O. Emission factors exhibit variability year-over-year due to weather, agricultural yield changes, and methodological refinements. For example, the Northern and Southern Plains regions showed spikes in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions due to climate variability and shifts in tillage practices. Variability in yield data, especially from sources like STATCAN, amplified per-unit emissions. While annual updates to emission factors commonly cause variability, maintaining methodological consistency is crucial. GMI updated its climate targets to align with SBTi FLAG guidance, expanding from 2 targets (Scope 1 & 2; Scope 3) to 6 targets: near-term and net-zero targets for Scope 1 & 2, Scope 3 FLAG, and Scope 3 non-FLAG emissions*

[Fixed row]

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

#### (7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

- Yes

#### (7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2, location-based
- Scope 2, market-based

Scope 3

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

*Annually, General Mills will review its base year emissions. According to the GHG Protocol, efforts are made to ensure a “like for like” base year is accounted. This means that emissions from business that are modified after the base year are included in or excluded from the base year (either actual or estimated). Materiality was evaluated using a 5% significance threshold, based on the business' contribution to GMI's GHG footprint as well as its sales. For each material structural change, General Mills recalculates GHG emissions for baseline year (2020), previous year, and current reporting year*

### (7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

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

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

### (7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

### (7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

### (7.3.3) Comment

*Emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol). Both location and market-based emissions have been externally verified by a third party, Apex Co. We use the market-based method defined by the GHG Protocol's Scope 2 standard and used the market-based method emission factor hierarchy and the location-based method emission factor hierarchy. Totals are rounded to the nearest hundredth to maintain consistency with verification letter.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

Select from:

No

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

#### Scope 1

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

341000

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

#### Scope 2 (location-based)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

512000

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

## Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

381700

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

## Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

## **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

12117000

## **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

### **Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods**

## **(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

## **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

229000

## **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

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

## **(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

## **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

237000

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

### **Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

#### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

4420000

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

### **Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations**

#### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

#### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

62000

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18000

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100000

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

## Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Not relevant. The minimum boundary for upstream leased assets is "The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of lessors that occur during the reporting company's operation of leased assets (e.g. from energy use)." We use the operational control approach to setting boundaries, and therefore leased assets would fall under scope 1 and 2 emissions. For example, leased warehouse space falls under scope 1 & scope 2 operational control, but has been deemed immaterial, at less than 1% of emissions and is verified each year*

## Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

484000

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

## Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

44000

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

## **Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not relevant. The minimum boundary for Use of Sold Products emissions covers the direct use-phase emissions from products that consume energy or release greenhouse gases during use. General Mills does not report these emissions because it falls below the materiality threshold. Therefore, these downstream, indirect emissions are excluded from our Scope 3 inventory.*

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

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.*

**Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets****(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not relevant. The minimum boundary for downstream leased assets is "The scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of lessees that occur during operation of leased assets (e.g. from energy use). General Mills does not currently calculate or report on Total Emissions for Downstream Leased Assets due to materiality threshold; we currently lease out three small properties, one of which is a plot of land. These leases do not meet our materiality threshold for Scope 3 Category 13 emissions calculations.*

**Scope 3 category 14: Franchises****(7.5.1) Base year end**

05/31/2020

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

5000

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

Emissions are calculated using "like to like" methodology. General Mills' Reporting Year 2020 GHG emissions totals listed here reflect a restated baseline that was not verified by Apex Companies, LLC. Original RY2020 GHG emissions were verified by Apex, prior to baseline restatements necessitated by merger and acquisition activities as well as structural changes.

### Scope 3 category 15: Investments

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant due to immateriality to General Mills

### Scope 3: Other (upstream)

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

05/31/2020

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

### Scope 3: Other (downstream)

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

Not Applicable  
[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	308000	Total rounded to the nearest thousandth, in accordance with verification letter.

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	492000	11000	Total rounded to the nearest thousandth, in accordance with verification letter.

[Fixed row]

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

### **Purchased goods and services**

#### **(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

Select from:

- Relevant, calculated

#### **(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)**

9595000

#### **(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

Select all that apply

- Supplier-specific method
- Average data method
- Spend-based method

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

11

#### **(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Process-based emission factors were assigned on a mass basis (i.e., kg CO<sub>2</sub>eq per kg purchased material). Agriculture: proxies were used where representative data was not available in the existing LCI databases. Supply-specified EFs: General Mills purchases several commodities from suppliers that are using specific agricultural interventions to reduce on-farm impacts and sequester carbon. Custom EFs: General Mills also purchases several ingredients that are not well-represented by emission factors in existing databases. In many of these cases, particularly where these ingredients represent either a substantial portion of total ingredient buy or an area of high potential for over- or underestimation, custom emission factors are used. These custom emission factors can be a blend of several existing EFs from ecoinvent/WFLDB, a figure taken from literature, or a value that's been scaled based on economic allocation principles. Some such EFs include pizza topping and cheese, mechanically separated chicken and lamb, organic wheat flour, and organic fluid milk, and wheat and oats sourced in specific supply sheds. Additional documentation on custom EF creation can be found in "Custom Emission Factor" section. TNT Crust business acquisition: In the last FY GHG calculation cycle, General Mills acquired the TNT Crust business. Because that brand is not fully integrated into the company's internal data systems, its impacts had to be estimated for the FY2020 baseline and FY2022. It was assumed that the business activities were largely the same as that of the NA Foodservice Business*

Segment, but TNT was scaled to 5.894% of NA Foodservice OU for all portions of its value chain. This was done based on FY2021 data around the relative sales of each business. Packaging: Assumptions surrounding the recycled content of specific materials were based on data provided from the packaging suppliers for paperboard, metal, and glass. Plastics were assumed to contain no recycled content. Recycled content was modeled by using virgin material datasets to represent the virgin percent, and by using datasets for recycled materials to represent the recycled percentage of each material.

## Capital goods

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

157000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Supplier-specific method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

"An average input-output-based emission factor was assigned on a dollar basis (i.e., kg CO2eq per USD spent) to all capital equipment expenditures. This methodology has been updated slightly from that of previous years; where in previous years a US economic input-output database was used in modeling, a newer British I/O database was used this year. This British database defaulted to emissions per 2011 British Pound, and these EFs were adjusted to be representative of a 2024 USD. Input/Output different categories of capital expenditures were mapped to different input-output emission factors Data was scaled to adjust for 35% cumulative inflation rate between 2011 and 2024."

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

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

186000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*The total amount of fuel/energy provided by General Mills was multiplied by the scope 3 emission factors to calculate the total GHG emissions.*

## Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

3488000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Fuel-based method

- Distance-based method

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

0

#### (7.8.5) Please explain

*For rail and truck transport, a standard ton/kilometer (tkm) calculation was used. This year, gallons data was provided for ocean transport. For rail and truck transport, a standard ton/kilometer (tkm) calculation was used. This year, gallons data was provided for ocean transport. Gallons activity data was assessed using a Marine Fuel Oil emission factor from DEFRA 2021 plus the emissions associated with production of marine fuel oil, from ecoinvent 3.9. Intermodal transport was assumed to be 80% rail and 20% truck. Temperature states are accounted for in truck transport only, and are based on modified ecoinvent datasets for frozen, refrigerated, and ambient truck datasets which contain additional upstream/ downstream emissions based on the refrigeration needs per tkm transported, and reflect the additional fuel needed to run the refrigeration on a per gallon basis.*

### Waste generated in operations

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- Relevant, calculated

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

27000

#### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- Average data method
- Waste-type-specific method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*The cutoff method was applied to recycling and incineration with energy recovery: impacts of the disposal method and transportation were applied, but no credit for recycling or energy recovery from incineration was given. In line with the GHG protocol guidance, recycling and reuse considered only the impacts of transporting the items to the recycling plant but did not include the impacts of the recycling process. Transport to waste treatment assumed a 5km distance from facility to the collection center, and 72km from the collection center to the waste treatment center.*

## Business travel

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

20000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Distance-based method

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

100

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Flight miles were multiplied by the cradle-to-gate emission factor (per person kilometer) to calculate the emissions associated with business travel.*

## Employee commuting

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

36000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*For North American employee commuting, U.S. Census data was used for the national distribution of modes of transportation to work. The Bureau of Transportation data was used to estimate the national average distance of a commute to work. The employee headcount was distributed amongst the different transportation modes and multiplied by the national average commuting distance. These were multiplied by their respective cradle-to-gate emission factors to calculate the GHG emissions associated with North American employee commuting. For international commuting, data from various sources were used to estimate breakdown of public transit, pedestrian, and car commute transport for Latin American, Asian, Indian, European, and Other regions. The employee headcount was distributed amongst the different transportation modes and multiplied by the U.S. national average commuting distance. These were multiplied by their respective cradle-to-gate emission factors to calculate the GHG emissions associated with international employee commuting.*

## Upstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Operation of assets leased by the reporting company (lessee) in the reporting year and not included in Scope 1 and Scope 2. All facilities are already accounted for in other categories. Most leased spaces are offices, meaning that General Mills has operational control over it and therefore it's already included in Scope 2.*

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

454000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Transportation and distribution of products sold by the reporting company in the reporting year between the reporting company's operations and the end consumer (if not paid for by the reporting company). It includes 3rd party warehouse and retail storage (in vehicles and facilities not owned or controlled by General Mills).*

## Processing of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

37000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Downstream processing (commercial baking) of products sold by General Mills to business customers including institutions and retailers*

### Use of sold products

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*General Mills does not meet the minimum boundary for Use of Sold Products emissions, which covers direct use-phase emissions from products that consume energy or release greenhouse gases during use. The Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) does not allow these downstream, indirect emissions to be included in Scope 3 reporting. Therefore, these emissions are excluded from our inventory.*

### End of life treatment of sold products

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

Select all that apply

- Waste-type-specific method

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

0

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Waste disposal and treatment of products sold by General Mills (in the reporting year) at the end of their life. It includes packaging EoL and food waste loss at the consumer stage.*

**Downstream leased assets****(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

Select from:

- Not relevant, explanation provided

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Operation of assets owned by the reporting company (lessor) and leased to other entities in the reporting year, not included in scope 1 and scope 2 – reported by lessor. This category is not applicable for General Mills business*

**Franchises****(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

Select from:

- Relevant, calculated

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

6400

## (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

## (7.8.5) Please explain

*Direct and indirect emissions of fuels and energy purchased by franchised operations (Häagen-Dazs)*

## Investments

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Emissions linked to General Mills' investments were estimated but represent less than 1% of scope 3. Therefore, they are immaterial and not reported.*

## Other (upstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not evaluated

### (7.8.5) Please explain

N/A

### Other (downstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not evaluated

### (7.8.5) Please explain

N/A

[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

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

**Row 1**

**(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Select from:

Annual process

**(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year**

Select from:

Complete

**(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance**

Select from:

Limited assurance

**(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement**

*General Mills F24 GHG Verification Limited 06302025.pdf*

**(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference**

*Pg. 1-3*

**(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard**

Select from:

ISO14064-3

**(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

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

**Row 1**

**(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach**

Select from:

- Scope 2 market-based

**(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Select from:

- Annual process

**(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year**

Select from:

- Complete

**(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance**

Select from:

- Limited assurance

**(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement**

*General Mills F24 GHG Verification Limited 06302025.pdf*

**(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference**

### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISO14064-3

### (7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

## Row 2

### (7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

Scope 2 location-based

### (7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

### (7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

### (7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

### (7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Pg. 1-3

### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISO14064-3

### (7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

#### Row 1

### (7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Franchises   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Purchased goods and services               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Capital goods  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Waste generated in operations              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Business travel  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Employee commuting   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Processing of sold products  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) |   |

### (7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

### (7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

### (7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

*General Mills F24 GHG Verification Limited 06302025.pdf*

### (7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

*Pg. 1-3*

### (7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISO14064-3

### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

*100*

*[Add row]*

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

Select from:

Decreased

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

### Change in renewable energy consumption

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14300

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In Fiscal 2024, we purchased and applied 1,240,453 MWh of Renewable Energy Credits (RECS). The emissions where a "zero" EF was applied equaled 646,005 MT CO2e when calculated using the eGrid EF's for the equivalent MWhs. This compares to Fiscal 2023, during which we generated and applied 1,213,073 MWh, or 631,746 MT CO2e, of REC purchases. Therefore, last year, our change in renewable energy consumption via Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs) was  $FY2024 \text{ EACs} - FY2023 \text{ EACs} = 646,000 - 631,700 = 14,300 \text{ MT CO2e}$ . Last year (Fiscal 2023), our total Scope 1 and 2 emissions was 356,300 MT CO2e, therefore we arrived at a % decrease through  $(- 14,300 / 356,300) * 100 = 4 \%$ . Note: F23 Scope 1 and 2 emissions have been restated to ensure year-over-year methodological consistency and reflect merger and acquisition activities.*

### Other emissions reduction activities

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We did not experience any change due to other emissions reduction activities.*

## Divestment

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We did not experience any change due to divestitures*

## Acquisitions

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We did not experience any change due to Acquisitions*

## Mergers

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We did not experience any change due to Mergers*

## Change in output

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

69800

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

8

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*General Mills decreased its output by 303 million pounds in F24 compared to F23. As a result of this decreased output and required raw materials, we saw a decrease of 69,800 MT CO2e in gross Scope 1 & 2 (location) emissions in F24 at manufacturing plants under our operational control. This means that the total change in emission from manufacturing output is equal to a 8% decrease  $(69,800/869,800)*100\% = 8\%$ . As renewable energy credits and guarantees of origin were applied when calculating gross S1 & S2 Market emissions, this decrease in manufacturing output is only reflected in S1 & 2 Location gross emission changes. Note: Total F22 Scope 1 and 2 have been restated to ensure year-over-year methodological consistency and reflect merger and acquisition activities.*

## Change in methodology

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We did not experience any change due to change in methodology*

#### **Change in boundary**

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*We did not experience any change due to change in boundary*

#### **Change in physical operating conditions**

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

*We did not experience any change due to change in physical operating conditions*

**Unidentified**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

*Select from:*

No change

**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

0

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

-

**Other**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

*Select from:*

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

-

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

Market-based

**(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.**

**CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)**

### (7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

44000

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

Sources for biofuel combustion in manufacturing processes at General Mills-owned facilities include oat hulls and wood burning. Emissions resulting from the combustion of these two biomass types were generated using standard emissions factors. Co2 emissions for biomass (wood and oat hulls) are calculated using standard Emissions Factors provided by DEFRA 2021 - set for advanced users.

## CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

### (7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

### (7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

Default emissions factors

### (7.13.1.3) Please explain

We do not account for any biofuels in our distribution.

[Fixed row]

## (7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

### Dairy & egg products

#### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

#### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1068500

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Dairy is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, including Yoplait and Haagen-Dazs. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable dairy because of its relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the dairy value chain. Dairy is one of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

## Maize/corn

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

152600

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

General Mills sources corn that is used with other grains in cereal and snack bars, canned sweet corn and popcorn. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

## Nuts

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

252100

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

Nuts is a significant agricultural commodity for many products as they are often a key flavor or functional component in General Mills brands, including Nature Valley, Larabar, and some cereals. General Mills is committed to advancing regenerative production systems within our nuts supply sheds (such as California) because of nuts connection to water stewardship, advancing regenerative agriculture, and the impact on climate change. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of

revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.

## Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

403200

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*General Mills is a significant buyer of oats for multiple brands, including large scale brands Cheerios and Nature Valley. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable oats because of this grain's relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the oat value chain. Oats is one of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

## Palm oil

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

302295

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Due to General Mills brands usage of Palm Oil [volume based], as well as known supply chain risks, General Mills has worked to source this commodity sustainably based on RSPO standards. Palm Oil is included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

## Sugar

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

637700

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Sugar is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, used in cereal, snacks, yogurt/ice cream, baked goods and other many other products. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable sugar because of its relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the sugar value chain. Sugar, both from beet and cane plants, are two of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

## Wheat

### (7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

### (7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

### (7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1890600

### (7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (7.14.6) Please explain

*Wheat is a significant agricultural commodity for many General Mills brands, including Big G Cereals like Wheaties, Gold Medal Flour, and Betty Crocker. General Mills is committed to sourcing sustainable wheat because of wheat's relevance in terms of total quantity purchased annually and the associated greenhouse gas emissions of the wheat value chain. Wheat is one of the ten priority ingredients included in our "10x20" sustainable sourcing program, which achieved 100% sustainable sourcing in 2020. Going forward, General Mills has shifted our focus to take a holistic approach to regenerating ecosystems and advancing human rights in order to more fully actualize opportunities that catalyze change. Percent of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity was estimated based on the estimated revenue per category and a rough calculation of brands within that category that use this commodity.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

Yes

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

#### Row 1

##### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

CO2

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

304800

### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

### Row 2

### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

CH4

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

400

### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

### Row 3

### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

N2O

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

200

### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

[Add row]

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

### Australia

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2736

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

6913

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

1703

### Belgium

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

### Brazil

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

5119

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

3760

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

0

**Canada**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

6167

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

3281

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

0

**China**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2326

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

33752

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

316

**France**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

7412

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

2263

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

0

**Germany**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

2

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

0

**Greece**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

864

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

3105

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

0

**Hong Kong SAR, China**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

131

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

2505

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

0

**India**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

289

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

4684

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

**Ireland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

3

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

14

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

0

**Italy**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

0

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

0

**Mexico**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

3232

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

5280

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

361

**Republic of Korea**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

0

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

0

**Singapore**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

3

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

17

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

0

## Spain

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7047

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

4436

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

0

## Switzerland

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7

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

3

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

0

## Taiwan, China

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

72

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

1377

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

1377

**United Arab Emirates**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

6

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

48

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

24

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

43

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

149

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

0

**United States of America**

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

272256

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

420132

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

6633

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

By business division

By activity

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

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	<i>Pet</i>	<i>33000</i>
Row 2	<i>North America Retail</i>	<i>217000</i>
Row 3	<i>North America Foodservice</i>	<i>31000</i>
Row 4	<i>International</i>	<i>27000</i>

[Add row]

**(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.**

**Row 1**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

*Liquid Propane Combustion*

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

4685

**Row 2**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

*BioMass*

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1680

**Row 3**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

*Natural Gas Combustion*

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

267865

**Row 4**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

23562

**Row 5**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

*Sales Fleet - Transportation Consumption*

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

7796

**Row 6**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

*LPG Combustion*

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1004

**Row 7**

**(7.17.3.1) Activity**

*Diesel Combustion*

**(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1133

[Add row]

**(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.**

**Row 1**

**(7.18.2.1) Activity**

Select from:

Processing/Manufacturing

**(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

276242

**(7.18.2.4) Methodology**

Select all that apply

Region-specific emissions factors

**(7.18.2.5) Please explain**

*Scope 1 values reported are for globally owned operations and have been third party verified. Emission factors for fuel usage are from DEFRA UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting Year 2023 Version 1.0 Full Set*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

By business division

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

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>North America Retail</i>	<i>306000</i>	<i>3000</i>
Row 2	<i>International</i>	<i>65000</i>	<i>4000</i>
Row 3	<i>Pet</i>	<i>34000</i>	<i>0</i>
Row 4	<i>North America Foodservice</i>	<i>87000</i>	<i>3900</i>

[Add row]

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

**Consolidated accounting group**

**(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

*308000*

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

*492000*

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

*11000*

#### (7.22.4) Please explain

*General Mills is a consolidated accounting group*

#### All other entities

#### (7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

#### (7.22.4) Please explain

*N/A*

*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select from:*

Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

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

#### Row 1

### **(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

CVS Health

### **(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 1

### **(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### **(7.26.6) Allocation method**

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### **(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Select from:

Currency

### **(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

34346615

### **(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e**

533

### **(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 2****(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

Costco Wholesale Corporation

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Currency

### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

761300086

### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

11808

### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 3

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Walmart, Inc.

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 1

### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Currency

**(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

4112625616

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

63790

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 5**

### **(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

Ahold Delhaize

### **(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 1

### **(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### **(7.26.6) Allocation method**

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### **(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Select from:

Currency

### **(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

602325522

### **(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e**

9343

### **(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 6****(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

Target Corporation

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 1

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Currency

### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

435681789

### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

6758

### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

### **(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made**

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.*

### **(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

## **Row 7**

### **(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

CVS Health

### **(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 2: market-based

### **(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### **(7.26.6) Allocation method**

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### **(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Select from:

Currency

**(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

34346615

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

19

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 8**

### **(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

- Costco Wholesale Corporation

### **(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

- Scope 2: market-based

### **(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

- Company wide

### **(7.26.6) Allocation method**

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### **(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Select from:

- Currency

### **(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

761300086

### **(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e**

422

### **(7.26.10) Uncertainty ( $\pm\%$ )**

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 9****(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

Walmart, Inc.

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 2: market-based

**(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Currency

### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4112625616

### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

2278

### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

### **(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made**

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.*

### **(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

## **Row 11**

### **(7.26.1) Requesting member**

*Select from:*

Ahold Delhaize

### **(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

*Select from:*

Scope 2: market-based

### **(7.26.4) Allocation level**

*Select from:*

Company wide

### **(7.26.6) Allocation method**

*Select from:*

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### **(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Select from:

Currency

**(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

602325522

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

334

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 12**

### **(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

Target Corporation

### **(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 2: market-based

### **(7.26.4) Allocation level**

Select from:

Company wide

### **(7.26.6) Allocation method**

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### **(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied**

Select from:

Currency

### **(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

435681789

### **(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e**

241

### **(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 13****(7.26.1) Requesting member**

Select from:

CVS Health

**(7.26.2) Scope of emissions**

Select from:

Scope 3

**(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)**

Select all that apply

- Category 14: Franchises
- Category 2: Capital goods
- Category 6: Business travel
- Category 7: Employee commuting
- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 10: Processing of sold products
- Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- Company wide

#### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

#### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Currency

#### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

34346615

#### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

26091

#### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

30

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Franchises*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

*Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2024 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.10. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.*

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 14

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Costco Wholesale Corporation

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 3

### (7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Category 14: Franchises
- Category 2: Capital goods
- Category 6: Business travel
- Category 7: Employee commuting
- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 10: Processing of sold products
- Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- Company wide

#### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

#### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Currency

#### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

761300086

#### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

578317

#### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

30

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Franchises*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

*Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2024 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.10. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.*

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 15

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Walmart, Inc.

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 3

### (7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Category 14: Franchises
- Category 2: Capital goods
- Category 6: Business travel
- Category 7: Employee commuting
- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 10: Processing of sold products
- Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- Company wide

#### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

#### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Currency

#### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4112625616

#### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

3124131

#### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

30

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Franchises*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

*Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2024 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.10. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.*

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 17

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Ahold Delhaize

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 3

### (7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Category 14: Franchises
- Category 2: Capital goods
- Category 6: Business travel
- Category 7: Employee commuting
- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 10: Processing of sold products
- Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- Company wide

#### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

#### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Currency

#### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

602325522

#### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

457552

#### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

30

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Franchises*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

*Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2024 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.10. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.*

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 18

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Target Corporation

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 3

### (7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Category 14: Franchises
- Category 2: Capital goods
- Category 6: Business travel
- Category 7: Employee commuting
- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 10: Processing of sold products
- Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- Company wide

#### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

#### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Currency

#### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

435681789

#### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

330963

#### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

30

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Franchises*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

*Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2024 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.10. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain.*

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 19

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Loblaw Companies Limited

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 1

### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Currency

### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1087217

### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e

17

### (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

15

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Burning fossil fuels at our wholly owned manufacturing plants*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with wholly owned global operations.

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

## Row 20

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

Loblaw Companies Limited

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

Scope 2: market-based

### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

Currency

**(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member**

1087217

**(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e**

1

**(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)**

15

**(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions**

*Consuming purchased electricity at our wholly owned manufacturing*

**(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?**

Select from:

No

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

*Sources are known at each wholly owned operation and GHG data is valid. However, GHG data from contract manufacturing of our products also sold to this customer is not included here. Allocation is based on % total sales of both owned plant and contract plant produced products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG (Scope 2 Market) associated with wholly owned global operations.*

**(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference**

-

**Row 21**

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

- Loblaw Companies Limited

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

- Scope 3

### (7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Category 14: Franchises
- Category 2: Capital goods
- Category 6: Business travel
- Category 7: Employee commuting
- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 10: Processing of sold products
- Category 5: Waste generated in operations
- Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

- Company wide

### (7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

- Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

### (7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

- Currency

### (7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1087217

### (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

826

### (7.26.10) Uncertainty ( $\pm\%$ )

30

### (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Categories accounted: Purchased goods and services, Capital goods, Fuel-and-energy related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2), Upstream transportation and distribution Waste generated in operations, Business travel, Employee commuting, Downstream transportation and distribution, Processing of sold products, End of life treatment of sold products, Franchises*

### (7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

No

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

*Scope 3 emissions were externally verified by Apex Co, LLC. Data is from an assessment completed in 2024 by LCA consultancy Quantis. Data sources include Quantis' World Food LCA database and Ecoinvent 3.10. The data covers GMI value chain excluding those sections not reported and is based on % total sales of products sold to this customer and, for simplicity, is assumed to correlate to the % of GHG associated with the GMI value chain*

### (7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

-

[Add row]

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

**Row 1**

**(7.27.1) Allocation challenges**

Select from:

- Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

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

*Carbon intensity varies by product and we do not track emissions by product, only by plant*

**Row 2**

**(7.27.1) Allocation challenges**

Select from:

- Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level

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

*We allocate by % sales to a particular customer rather than actual emissions associated with those specific products sold to that customer.  
[Add row]*

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

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

Select from:

- No

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

Select from:

- Other, please specify :The organization is too large to track all customers and products

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

*Carbon intensity varies by product and we do not track emissions by product, only by plant. We allocate by % sales to a particular customer rather than actual emissions associated with those specific products sold to that customer.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

#### Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

##### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV (lower heating value)

##### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

138096

##### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1455430

##### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1593526.00

#### Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1240453

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1229776

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

2470229.00

## Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1068

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1068.00

## Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4500

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

4500.00

## Total energy consumption

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1383049

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2686273

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

4069322.00

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

**Sustainable biomass**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

LHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

110803

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

110803

#### (7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

110803

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*The criteria used to classify the biomass as sustainable varied by biomass source. We use two types of sustainable biomass, oat hulls, which are a by-product in our oat production and would otherwise be discarded. The other source is wood, where we used certifications to determine it was sustainably sourced.*

#### Other biomass

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

LHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

27293

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

27293

#### (7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

27293

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

## Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

### (7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

-

## Coal

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

0

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

-

## **Oil**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

LHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

9280

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

9280

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

9278

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

-

## **Gas**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

LHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

1446150

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

1446150

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

1446150

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

-

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

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

0

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

0

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

0

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

-

**Total fuel**

**(7.30.7.1) Heating value**

Select from:

LHV

**(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

1593525

**(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat**

1593525

**(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

1593525

**(7.30.7.8) Comment**

-

[Fixed row]

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

**Electricity**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

4500

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

4500

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

4500

**(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

4500

**Heat**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

0

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

0

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

0

**Steam**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

0

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

0

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

0

## **Cooling**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

0

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

0

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

0

*[Fixed row]*

**(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.**

**Row 1**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

Australia

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

Select from:

Wind

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

7629

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

Australian LGC

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Australia

### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

## Row 2

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Brazil

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

29153

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

Other, please specify :EAC

**(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute**

Select from:

Brazil

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 3**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

China

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

62614

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Other, please specify :EAC

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

China

### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

**Row 4**

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

France

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

63762

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Other, please specify :EAC

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

France

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

Yes

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

1949

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

*EACs applied to France electricity consumption sourced from numerous hydroelectric production facilities ranging from commissioning years 1949 (oldest) -1995 (newest).*

### Row 5

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Germany

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

Other, please specify :EAC

**(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute**

Select from:

Germany

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 6****(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

Greece

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

8453

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Other, please specify :EAC

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Greece

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

Yes

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

1968

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

## Row 7

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

- Hong Kong SAR, China

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

- Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

- Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

- Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3910

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- GO

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

- Hong Kong SAR, China

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 8**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

India

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

6498

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

India

### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

## Row 9

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Ireland

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

43

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Ireland

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

### Row 10

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Mexico

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

- Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

- Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

- Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

12063

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

- Mexico

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

- No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

## Row 11

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Singapore

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

0

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Singapore

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 12**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

Republic of Korea

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

0

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Republic of Korea

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

### Row 13

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Spain

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

26979

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Spain

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

Yes

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

1981

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

## Row 14

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Switzerland

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

401

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Switzerland

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 15**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

Taiwan, China

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

0

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Taiwan, China

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

### Row 16

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

United Arab Emirates

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

51

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

United Arab Emirates

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

### Row 17

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

- Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

- Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

- Hydropower (capacity unknown)

### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

792

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- GO

### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

- No

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

**Row 18**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

Canada

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

10826

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

GO

**(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute**

Select from:

Canada

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 19**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

United States of America

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

**(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type**

Select from:

Wind

**(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)**

**(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used**

Select from:

- US-REC

**(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute**

Select from:

- United States of America

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

- No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

**Row 20**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

- Netherlands

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

- Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

0

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Netherlands

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

**Row 21**

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Taiwan, China

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

0

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Taiwan, China

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

-

### Row 22

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Belgium

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

0

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

**(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute**

Select from:

Belgium

**(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?**

Select from:

No

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

-

[Add row]

**(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.**

**Australia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

7629

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

370

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

7999.00

## Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

## Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29153

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

29153.00

**Canada**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

10826

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

10826.00

## China

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

62614

### (7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

572

### (7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

63186.00

## France

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

63762

### (7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

63762.00

**Germany**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

5

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

5.00

**Greece**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

8453

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

784

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

9237.00

**Hong Kong SAR, China**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

3910

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

3910.00

## India

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6498

### (7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

6498.00

## Ireland

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

43

### (7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

### (7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

43.00

## **Italy**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

0.00

## **Mexico**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

12063

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

12063.00

**Republic of Korea**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

0.00

**Singapore**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

0.00

**Spain**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

26979

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

2775

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

29754.00

**Switzerland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

401

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

401.00

**Taiwan, China**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

0.00

**United Arab Emirates**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

51

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

51.00

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

792

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

792.00

**United States of America**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

1007273

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)**

1007273.00

[Fixed row]

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

**Row 1**

**(7.45.1) Intensity figure**

1.61E-5

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

319000

**(7.45.3) Metric denominator**

Select from:

unit total revenue

**(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total**

**(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used**

Select from:

 Market-based**(7.45.6) % change from previous year**

9

**(7.45.7) Direction of change**

Select from:

 Decreased**(7.45.8) Reasons for change**

Select all that apply

 Change in renewable energy consumption Other emissions reduction activities Change in output**(7.45.9) Please explain**

*In F24, within our owned operations we have reduced emissions (Scope 1 and 2) by 9% compared to last year, primarily due to our ongoing progress in energy efficiency and focus on renewable electricity. Revenue decreased in F24 compared to F23. One factor that contributed to this Scope 2 Market decrease is that, during fiscal 2024, the energy usage rate at our production facilities decreased by 1% compared to the prior year, as efficiency improvements offset higher production of energy-intensive products. Another contributing factor to this decrease in Scope 2 Market emissions intensity is that during fiscal 2022, energy usage at our production facilities decreased by 5% compared to the prior year, as efficiency improvements offset higher production of energy-intensive products. We completed 25 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company. In total, these projects saved approximately 10.6 million kWh of electricity, 57,000 MMBTU of natural gas, and avoided approximately 10251 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e of GHG emissions. For example, through 12 projects to retrofit LED lighting across our North American facilities, we are saving more than 8 million kWh of electricity annually. A third contributing factor is due to progress made on our RE100 commitment. In fiscal 2024, we purchased and applied 1,018,099 MWh of Renewable Energy Credits (RECS) generated through a VPPA in the United States and Canada, which is reflected in our Scope 2 Market emissions. We also purchased 222,353 MWh EACs. These resulted in a total GHG savings of 37,300 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e in F24*

*[Add row]*

**(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?**

Select all that apply

Absolute target

**(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.**

**Row 1**

**(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

Abs 2

**(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?**

Select from:

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

**(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

*SBTI TARGETS DATA .xlsx*

**(7.53.1.4) Target ambition**

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

**(7.53.1.5) Date target was set**

*08/29/2024*

**(7.53.1.6) Target coverage**

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)

### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 3

### (7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

- Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel (not included in Scope 1 or 2)
- Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)
- Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations
- Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

05/31/2020

### (7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6561000

**(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

237000

**(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4418000

**(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

62000

**(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

18000

**(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1249000

**(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

12545000.000

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

12545000.000

**(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

90

**(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

99

**(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

30

**(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)**

87

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target***06/01/2030***(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)***29***(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)***8906950.000***(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)***4757000***(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)***186000***(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)***3487000***(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)***27000***(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

20000

**(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1078000

**(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

9555000.000

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

9555000.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

82.19

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 3 activities per the GHG Protocol and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by <http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*Near-Term Targets: General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1, 2, and scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, and end of life treatment of sold products 30% by FY2030 from a FY2020 base year.\* Within that target, General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 42% by FY2030 from a FY2020 base year.\* \*The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

#### **(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*Our plan to achieve the target includes seven key levers across our value chain: regenerative agriculture, reductions in dairy farm impacts, eliminating deforestation, energy efficiency, renewable electricity, transportation efficiency, and reducing food waste. We plan to get back on track through renewed focus and changing how we resource climate work. We're also bringing in external guidance. Our anticipated progress curve will be exponential – the rate of progress towards the target is anticipated to be faster at the end.*

#### **(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

Select from:

No

#### **Row 2**

#### **(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

Abs 1

#### **(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?**

Select from:

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

#### **(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

SBTI TARGETS DATA .xlsx

#### **(7.53.1.4) Target ambition**

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

#### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/29/2024

#### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

#### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

Carbon dioxide (CO2)

Methane (CH4)

Nitrous oxide (N2O)

#### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

Scope 1

Scope 2

#### (7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

Market-based

#### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

05/31/2020

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

341000

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

381700

**(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

0.000

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

722700.000

**(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1**

100

**(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

100.0

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

100

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/01/2030

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

42

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

419166.000

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

308000

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

11000

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

319000.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

- Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

133.00

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

- Achieved and maintained

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 1 & 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol) and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by <http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*Near-Term Targets: General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1, 2, and scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, and end of life treatment of sold products 30% by FY2030 from a FY2020 base year.\* Within that target, General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 42% by FY2030 from a FY2020 base year.\* \*The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

### **(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

Select from:

No

### **(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target**

*500,000 acres enrolled in regenerative agriculture programs/Delivered our 2020 sustainable sourcing commitment/ Reduced Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 51% and reduced total value chain emissions by 7%\*/Sourced renewable electricity for 97% of global operations*

## **Row 3**

### **(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

Abs 3

### **(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?**

Select from:

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

### **(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

*SBTI TARGETS DATA .xlsx*

### **(7.53.1.4) Target ambition**

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

12/29/2024

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)

### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 3

### (7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

- Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel  
Scope 1 or 2
- Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in  
Scope 1 or 2)
- Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations
- Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products
- Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

05/31/2020

**(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

6561000

**(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

237000

**(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4418000

**(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

62000

**(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

18000

**(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1249000

**(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

12545000.000

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

12545000.000

**(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

90

**(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

99

**(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

30

**(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)**

87

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

87

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/01/2050

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

90

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

1254500.000

**(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4757000

**(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

186000

**(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

3487000

**(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

27000

**(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

20000

**(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1078000

**(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

9555000.000

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

9555000.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

26.48

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 1 & 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol) and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by <http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>*

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*Overall Net-Zero Target: General Mills Inc. commits to reach net-zero greenhouse gas emissions across the value chain by FY2050. Long-Term Targets: General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by FY2050 from a FY2020 base year.\* General Mills also commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, downstream transportation and distribution and end of life treatment of sold products 90% within the same timeframe. \*The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*Our plan to achieve the target includes seven key levers across our value chain: regenerative agriculture, reductions in dairy farm impacts, eliminating deforestation, energy efficiency, renewable electricity, transportation efficiency, and reducing food waste. We plan to get back on track through renewed focus and changing how we resource climate work. We're also bringing in external guidance. Our anticipated progress curve will be exponential – the rate of progress towards the target is anticipated to be faster at the end.*

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

#### Row 4

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 4

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTI TARGETS DATA .xlsx

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/29/2024

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

### (7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

- Market-based

**(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

05/31/2020

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

341000

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

381700

**(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

0.000

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

722700.000

**(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1**

100

**(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

100

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

100

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/01/2050

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

90

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

72270.000

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

308000

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

11000

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

319000.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

62.07

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 1 & 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol) and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified, and this target has been endorsed by <http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

Overall Net-Zero Target: General Mills Inc. commits to reach net-zero greenhouse gas emissions across the value chain by FY2050. Long-Term Targets: General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by FY2050 from a FY2020 base year.\* General Mills also commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, downstream transportation and distribution and end of life treatment of sold products 90% within the same timeframe. \*The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.

### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Our plan to achieve the target includes seven key levers across our value chain: regenerative agriculture, reductions in dairy farm impacts, eliminating deforestation, energy efficiency, renewable electricity, transportation efficiency, and reducing food waste. We plan to get back on track through renewed focus and changing how we resource climate work. We're also bringing in external guidance. Our anticipated progress curve will be exponential – the rate of progress towards the target is anticipated to be faster at the end.

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

## Row 5

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 5

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

#### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

#### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/29/2024

#### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

#### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

#### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 3

#### (7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

- Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

05/31/2020

**(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

5557000

**(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1000

**(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

5558000.000

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

5558000.000

**(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

90

**(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)**

95

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

95

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/01/2030

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

30.3

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

3873926.000

**(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4838000

**(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1000

**(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4839000.000

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

4839000.000

### (7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

### (7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

42.69

### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 1 & 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol) and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by <http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>*

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*Near-Term Targets: General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1, 2, and scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, and end of life treatment of sold products 30% by FY2030 from a FY2020 base year.\* Within that target, General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 42% by FY2030 from a FY2020 base year.\* \*The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*Our plan to achieve the target includes seven key levers across our value chain: regenerative agriculture, reductions in dairy farm impacts, eliminating deforestation, energy efficiency, renewable electricity, transportation efficiency, and reducing food waste. We plan to get back on track through renewed focus and changing how we resource climate work. We're also bringing in external guidance. Our anticipated progress curve will be exponential – the rate of progress towards the target is anticipated to be faster at the end.*

### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

## Row 6

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 6

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*SBTI TARGETS DATA .xlsx*

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

*08/29/2024*

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)

### **(7.53.1.8) Scopes**

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 3

### **(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories**

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

### **(7.53.1.11) End date of base year**

05/31/2020

### **(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

5557000

### **(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1000

### **(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

5558000.000

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

5558000.000

**(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

90

**(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)**

95

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

95

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

06/01/2050

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

72

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

1556240.000

**(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4838000

**(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

1000

**(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

4839000.000

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

4839000.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

**(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year**

17.97

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*The base year emissions include all "like-for-like" Scope 1 & 2 activities under operational control (per the GHG Protocol) and covers company-wide. These emissions have been externally verified and this target has been endorsed by <http://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*Overall Net-Zero Target: General Mills Inc. commits to reach net-zero greenhouse gas emissions across the value chain by FY2050. Long-Term Targets: General Mills commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by FY2050 from a FY2020 base year.\* General Mills also commits to reduce absolute scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, fuel and energy-related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, downstream transportation and distribution and end of life treatment of sold products 90% within the same timeframe. \*The target boundary includes land-related emissions and removals from bioenergy feedstocks.*

#### **(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*Our plan to achieve the target includes seven key levers across our value chain: regenerative agriculture, reductions in dairy farm impacts, eliminating deforestation, energy efficiency, renewable electricity, transportation efficiency, and reducing food waste. We plan to get back on track through renewed focus and changing how we resource climate work. We're also bringing in external guidance. Our anticipated progress curve will be exponential – the rate of progress towards the target is anticipated to be faster at the end.*

#### **(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

Select from:

No

[Add row]

#### **(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?**

Select all that apply

Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

#### **(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.**

##### **Row 1**

#### **(7.54.1.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

Low 1

#### **(7.54.1.2) Date target was set**

04/01/2020

### (7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

Consumption

### (7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

Renewable energy source(s) only

### (7.54.1.7) End date of base year

05/31/2019

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

1201326

### (7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

23.6

### (7.54.1.10) End date of target

**(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target**

100

**(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year**

98.9

**(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year**

98.56

**(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?**

Yes, Abs1

**(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?**

Select all that apply

RE100

**(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*In April 2020 we joined the RE100 initiative and set a company-wide target to achieve 100% renewable electricity consumption by 2030. This date is part of our Fiscal 2019 time frame (June 2018 - May 2019) which is why we have our Baseline Year and Reporting year set to 2019. Our baseline is Fiscal 2019 of 23.6% renewable electricity and covers global sites under operational control (Manufacturing, R&D, Offices, Warehouses, HD Shops, and Cake Kitchens). This target is part of our absolute Scope 1 & 2 market reduction target Abs 1.*

**(7.54.1.20) Target objective**

In 2020 we committed to the RE100 initiative. Since then, we've sourced 98.9% of our energy needs from renewable sources and plan to deliver 100% by 2030

**(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*LOW-CARBON ENERGY IN MANUFACTURING We're assessing new systems, like renewable thermal technology, to help us further reduce our natural gas usage in our manufacturing sites. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN MANUFACTURING We'll continue our best-in-class Five Step Energy Reduction process to push for further energy efficiencies at our sites. ADVANCE OUR SUPPLIER SCOPE 1 & 2 REDUCTIONS We are seeking out opportunities to remove common barriers to renewable energy procurement within our supplier community.NET ZERO ENERGY BEYOND 2030 We continue to evaluate emerging technologies that will eliminate our dependency on fossil fuels in our facilities by 2050.*

[Add row]

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

Select from:

Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	0	`Numeric input
To be implemented	0	0
Implementation commenced	0	0
Implemented	25	10251
Not to be implemented	0	`Numeric input

[Fixed row]

**(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.**

**Row 1**

**(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in buildings

Lighting

**(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)**

20251

**(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur**

*Select all that apply*

Scope 2 (market-based)

**(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory**

*Select from:*

Voluntary

**(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

2379000

**(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

7181000

**(7.55.2.7) Payback period**

*Select from:*

4-10 years

### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

11-15 years

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*We identify and implement improvements through our Five-Step Energy Reduction Process, by working with our manufacturing plants to establish energy programs, conduct energy analyses, develop and execute improvement plans and validate results. This process historically focused on facilities with significant spending on energy. We have recently evolved it to include all General Mills manufacturing facilities by focusing improvement efforts on common systems such as compressed air, lighting and steam/hot water. During fiscal 2024, we completed 25 energy efficiency and reduction projects across the company. In total, these projects saved approximately 10.6 million kWh of electricity, 57,000 MMBTU of natural gas, and avoided approximately 10251 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e of GHG emissions. To supplement our plant staffing teams and their energy reduction efforts, we continued our partnership in 2024 with Energy One to advance our efficiency and reliability program. Through a detailed mapping of energy flows, our teams work together to identify sustainable solutions for process optimization. In 2024 we expanded beyond our program pilot in our Covington, Georgia, facility. The team completed 74 items across 9 different sites and continues working on more than 180 additional items across 15 sites to deliver additional resource efficiency and savings.*

[Add row]

## (7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

### Row 1

#### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Marginal abatement cost curve

#### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*General Mill's has begun using the method of a marginal abatement cost curve to drive investment in emissions reduction activities. Global Sustainability partnered with supply chain leads to identify GHG reduction opportunities. Examples include packaging material changes, farm-level investments, and energy efficiency projects. These opportunities were paired with cost estimates to generate a supply chain MACC tool, which compares potential GHG reduction initiatives in terms of dollar per metric ton of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduction potential.*

## Row 2

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Employee engagement

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*General Mills uses employee engagement as a method to drive investment in emissions reduction activities. Originally launched in 2016 and updated throughout FY 2023, we developed an online GHG training for all employees globally to help educate and drive responsible decision making. This site familiarizes employees with our core commitments, key learning resources, our Global Impact Governance Committee and Steering Team. We have been working with employees in marketing, sourcing and supply chain to help them to realize that the decisions that they make have an effect on the overall GHG footprint of the company. In conjunction with Earth Day, the company hosted a series of educational events at our Minneapolis headquarters to teach employees about the opportunities and challenges of reducing our environmental footprint.*

## Row 3

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*We will use the method of having a dedicated budget for energy efficiency to drive investment in emission reduction activities. Normal annual capital investment in utility efficiency projects totals ~\$5MM [lighting, compressed air, HVAC; efficient motors; etc]Ongoing, GMI corporate Engineering function funds the salaries, benefits, training & travel of a corporate staff of 2 Energy Leaders working 100% of time on utility efficiency improvements totaling ~\$1million in expense costs annually.- In GMI's 30 largest food processing plant sites (which represent 75% of the company's total annual utility spend) there are engineers and technicians who invest a percentage of their time each year on maintenance, operational and small project initiatives designed to improve energy efficiency. This manpower investment specifically on energy efficiency is estimated to total over \$500M annually.*

## Row 4

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*General Mill's states that we will "Do the Right Thing" all the time which will drive investment in emission reduction activities to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements / standards. We will make necessary investments to ensure that we remain within regulatory limits.*

[Add row]

## **(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?**

Select from:

Yes

### **(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.**

#### **Row 1**

#### **(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number**

Select from:

MP1

#### **(7.68.1.2) Management practice**

Select from:

Land use change

#### **(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice**

*We believe the most promising solution to reach our climate goals and create positive planetary outcomes is through regenerative agriculture, which we define as a holistic, principles-based approach to farming and ranching that seeks to strengthen ecosystems and community resilience. This inclusive approach is relevant to all*

types of farms – large and small, conventional and organic. Regenerative agriculture can help address climate change by pulling carbon from the atmosphere and sequestering it in the soil, improving soil health and driving other benefits, such as improving nutrient cycling, so less synthetic fertilizer is needed. These elements of regenerative agriculture help to contribute emission reductions toward our climate goals. This is important because today, the food system accounts for one-third of all GHG emissions, with around 70% from agriculture and conversion of natural lands to farmland. In 2023, Agriculture and transformation accounted for 40% of General Mills' scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, regenerative agriculture is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain and can help maintain a steady supply of high-quality ingredients while addressing some of the world's biggest environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities. General Mills works with partners and farmers to integrate six core principles of regenerative agriculture: Understand context of farm operation; Minimize disturbance; Maximize diversity; Keep the soil covered; Maintain living roots year-round; Integrate livestock. We use an outcomes-based approach, as opposed to one based on practices, believing that regenerative systems are unique to each farm context and seek to deliver measurable improvements in the following areas: Soil health and carbon sequestration, biodiversity, cow and herd well-being, water quality and quantity, and farmer economic resilience.

#### (7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

- Financial
- Knowledge sharing

#### (7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

We work to advance regenerative agriculture in a variety of ways, and in collaboration with farmers and industry experts:•Context: We work to understand local context so that our actions align with unique needs and connect to complementary efforts to ensure a holistic approach.•Education: In multiday workshops, farmers learn about regenerative principles and hear from local farmers about how they are practicing regenerative agriculture, to develop a regenerative mindset and view their operations differently.•Coaching: Farmers receive one on- one coaching for three years to help develop and implement regenerative management plans.•Community: We connect farmers practicing regenerative agriculture to one another, through field days, cafe meet-ups, and groups on social media, to build community and provide mutual support.•Measurement: We are tracking changes in soil health, biodiversity, water quality and farmer economics over several years as farmers implement their regenerative management plans•Market: We work to increase market opportunities for farmers using regenerative management practices. We are a Founding Circle member of the Ecosystem Services Market Consortium and plan to pilot a market-based incentive mechanism so farmers can be paid for the environmental services they provide through regenerative agriculture. To advance adoption of regenerative agriculture, we have partnered with Soil Health Academy and Understanding Ag to activate pilots in priority ingredient sourcing regions. In addition to and in coordination with our pilots, we are collaborating with leading conservation organizations within key supply sheds to drive further progress in advancing regenerative agriculture systems including: •Partnership with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) in the Great Lakes Basin and the Northern and Southern Great Plains to hire field conservation professionals who support farmers in areas that are important for fish and wildlife. •Soil health programs with the Wilkin County, Walsh County, and Kittson County Soil & Water Conservation Districts in the Northern Plains, and with the Kansas Soil Health Alliance and the Oklahoma Conservation Commission in the Southern Plains. •Partnership with ALUS Canada's Growing Roots regenerative agriculture community hubs in the prairie provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

#### (7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

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

### (7.68.1.7) Comment

none  
[Add row]

**(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?**

Select from:

- Yes

**(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?**

Select from:

- Yes

**(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.**

**Row 1**

### (7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

- MP1

### (7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

Positive

### (7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

Biodiversity

Soil

Water

### (7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

*We are on a journey to make a meaningful difference through regenerative agriculture. We define regenerative agriculture as a holistic, principles-based approach to farming and ranching that seeks to strengthen ecosystems and community resilience. This inclusive approach is relevant to all types of farms – large and small, conventional and organic. Regenerative agriculture is a powerful lever for change across the agricultural supply chain and can help maintain a steady supply of high-quality ingredients while addressing some of the world’s biggest environmental, social and economic challenges and opportunities. We believe regenerative agriculture works best when the farming or ranching operation is viewed as a living ecosystem. Our approach seeks to drive adoption of regenerative agriculture principles – and measure environmental and economic outcomes – across five key areas: biodiversity, water management, soil health, cow & herd well-being, farmer livelihoods and community resilience. One example of the impact of regenerative agriculture is on water. California is a key supply shed for General Mills for about 50 ingredients, including almonds. Our engagement on regenerative agriculture helps reduce negative agricultural impacts on water quality and quantity, helping protect and restore clean groundwater. Our business has its greatest land exposure in row crop farming for things like wheat, oats, and corn as well as dairy. It is in these farming systems within our supply shed areas that we believe we can have the largest impact on biodiversity by helping to advance regenerative agriculture. Improving biodiversity is a targeted outcome of our approach, with regenerative agriculture principles focused on improvements to the whole ecosystem, including animals, invertebrates, plants and microorganisms. We support grassland protection and regeneration across our major grain sourcing regions in the U.S. through our partnership with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) and also address tropical biodiversity through forest-positive strategies that support habitats and drive other targeted regenerative agriculture outcomes.*

### (7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

Yes

### (7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

California is a key supply shed for General Mills for about 50 ingredients, including almonds. In California's Central Valley land conversion and water use practices have accelerated local climate change leading to reduced snowpack and increasingly intense wildfires and droughts. Higher temperatures are expected to increase pest pressure that attacks almonds. Our engagement on regenerative agriculture helps reduce negative agricultural impacts on water quality and quantity, helping protect and restore clean groundwater. In F21, our Larabar brand funded research by the Ecdysis Foundation on 7 farms to evaluate how regenerative practices on almond orchards link to outcomes, including water infiltration rates and soil water holding capacity. Preliminary research results indicate positive water results from regenerative approaches, for example a 6x faster water infiltration rate vs. conventionally managed soil, indicating potential for reduced irrigation intensity, improved groundwater recharge, and improved drought resilience. We are funding research by UC Davis on 6 farms to examine water balance on regenerative vs. conventional almond orchards. We have ongoing conversations with several almond suppliers to determine how best to collaborate to advance regenerative almonds. Success of our supply shed engagement is measured by year-on-year increase in farmers who are adopting regenerative agriculture associated with our funded programs. Through 2023 we have engaged 500,000+ acres in programs designed to advance regenerative agriculture. Measuring outcomes today is a significant undertaking, requiring time, manual field sampling, and expensive data analysis. We are leading the industry in developing robust scientific methodologies to monitor and study outcomes such as biodiversity associated with regenerative actions. We are using satellite imagery to track changes in agriculture practices implemented in key supply sheds such as reduced/no-till and regenerative principles like length of time with a living root in the soil, on the landscape over time and model the resulting impacts. We are developing more scalable approaches to monitoring biodiversity across farms, utilizing microphones for recording birds and light sensors to detect insects, and are investing in research to enable further build out of impact metrics related to biodiversity, water and resiliency.

[Add row]

### **(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?**

Select from:

No, I am not providing data

### **(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?**

Select from:

Yes

#### **(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.**

##### **Row 1**

##### **(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation**

Select from:

Group of products or services

### (7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

Other, please specify :Life Cycle Analysis

### (7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

Other, please specify :Ready to eat products that don't require refrigeration/freezing

### (7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

*Ready to eat products that don't require refrigeration/freezing. Ready to eat products do not require a consumer to use fossil fuel for preparation. Snacks, Ready to Eat Cereal, and Pet platforms made up 50% of company sales in fiscal 2024. cooking required is done at the manufacturing level, where "economies of scale" and energy efficiency projects lead to reduced fossil fuel use per product, and therefore avoided emissions at the consumer level.*

### (7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

No

### (7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

50

[Add row]

### (7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

No

## C8. Environmental performance - Forests

### (8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Palm oil	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

### (8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Palm oil	98591	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	97732

[Fixed row]

### (8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

#### Palm oil

##### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Indonesia

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Aceh, Bangka Belitung, Bangka Tengah, Banten, Bengkulu, Jambi, Kalimantan, Konawe Selatan, Lampung, Riau, Papua, Sulawesi, Sumatera*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

78787

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Malaysia

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Johor, Kedah, Kelantan, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Pulau Pinang, Sabah, Sarawak, Selangor, Trengganu*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

15314

### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

- Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

## **Palm oil**

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

*Select from:*

- Brazil

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

*Select from:*

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Para*

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

2309

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>

### Palm oil

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Colombia

#### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

#### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Antioquia, Bolivar, Casanare, Cesar, Cundinamarca, Magdalena, Meta, Narino, Norte de Santander, Santander

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

583

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Papua New Guinea

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Oro, West New Britain

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

35

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Guatemala

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Alta Verapaz, Escuintla, Izabal, Peten*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

193

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Full mill list available on website <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Honduras

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Atlantida, Colon, Yoro*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

27

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

- Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Full mill list available on website <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

- Mexico

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

129

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>

### Palm oil

#### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Thailand

#### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

#### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Surat Thani, Trang, Nakhon Si Thammarat

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

107

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Côte d'Ivoire

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Bas-Sassandra

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

43

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Cambodia

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Kaoh Kong*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

53

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Costa Rica

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Puntarenas*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

86

### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>

## Palm oil

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Panama

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Chiriqui*

### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

43

### (8.5.5) Source

*Select all that apply*

- Contracted suppliers (processors)

### (8.5.7) Please explain

*Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

## **Palm oil**

### (8.5.1) Country/area of origin

*Select from:*

- Peru

### (8.5.2) First level administrative division

*Select from:*

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

### (8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

*Loreto*

#### (8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

21

#### (8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

Contracted suppliers (processors)

#### (8.5.7) Please explain

Full mill list available on website: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>  
[Add row]

#### (8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

Select from:

No

#### (8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

##### Palm oil

#### (8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

#### (8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

Suppliers

## **(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target**

Select from:

Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

### **(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.**

#### **Palm oil**

##### **(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target**

Select from:

No-deforestation

##### **(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"**

*General Mills uses the No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation Implementation Reporting Framework (NDPE-IRF) to measure and report progress on our goals for No Deforestation and No Peatland Conversion in our palm supply chain, and utilize this framework's definition of No Deforestation and No Peat*

##### **(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date**

Select from:

2015

##### **(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date**

Select from:

Applied globally

##### **(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date**

Select from:

- Sector-wide agreement/recommendation

#### (8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

- 2025

[Add row]

**(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.**

### Palm oil

#### (8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

- Target 1

#### (8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

- Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

#### (8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

- Suppliers

#### (8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

- Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

#### **(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

Traceability

% of volume traceable to traceability point

#### **(8.7.2.6) Traceability point**

Select from:

Production unit

#### **(8.7.2.8) Date target was set**

01/01/2020

#### **(8.7.2.9) End date of base year**

12/31/2020

#### **(8.7.2.10) Base year figure**

0

#### **(8.7.2.11) End date of target**

12/31/2025

#### **(8.7.2.12) Target year figure**

100

#### **(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure**

90.59

#### **(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

#### (8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

90.59

#### (8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Other, please specify

#### (8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Target applies to all volumes procured globally by General Mills*

#### (8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*Leveraging support from experts at Proforest, General Mills conducts an annual analysis of aggregated purchasing volumes. In relation to traceability, 95% percent of our palm oil volume was categorized as traceable to the extraction mill, while further upstream, our traceability of FFB to known production (plantation) is 90%. For more information please refer to our Palm Oil Statement: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

#### (8.7.2.20) Further details of target

*Aligned to Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action Palm Oil Roadmap*

### **Palm oil**

#### (8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 2

#### (8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

- Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

### (8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

- Suppliers

### (8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

- Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

### (8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Third-party certification

- % of volume third-party certified

### (8.7.2.7) Third-party certification scheme

Chain-of-custody certification

- RSPO supply chain certification - Mass Balance
- RSPO supply chain certification – Segregated

### (8.7.2.8) Date target was set

01/01/2010

### (8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/31/2010

### (8.7.2.10) Base year figure

0

**(8.7.2.11) End date of target**

12/31/2025

**(8.7.2.12) Target year figure**

100

**(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure**

98.7

**(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year**

98.70

**(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

Other, please specify

**(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Target applies to all volumes procured globally by General Mills*

**(8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*In 2010, we made a commitment to source 100% of our palm oil from responsible and sustainable sources, through the purchase of RSPO certified volumes. We have continued to maintain that ambition year on year, including a purchasing shift toward mass balance and segregated oil and away from certificates. For more information please refer to our Palm Oil Statement: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

#### **(8.7.2.20) Further details of target**

*Aligned to Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action Palm Oil Roadmap*

### **Palm oil**

#### **(8.7.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

Target 3

#### **(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7**

*Select from:*

Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

#### **(8.7.2.3) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

Suppliers

#### **(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)**

*Select from:*

Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

#### **(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

Engagement with Tier 1 suppliers

% of Tier 1 suppliers engaged

**(8.7.2.8) Date target was set**

09/01/2017

**(8.7.2.9) End date of base year**

12/31/2017

**(8.7.2.10) Base year figure**

0

**(8.7.2.11) End date of target**

12/31/2025

**(8.7.2.12) Target year figure**

100

**(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure**

100

**(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year**

100.00

**(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

Other, please specify

### (8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Target applies to all volumes procured globally by General Mills*

### (8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*With support from expert partners at Proforest, we will continue to leverage an annual supplier engagement process designed to evaluate the progress of our direct palm suppliers in meeting the principles set out in our palm oil sourcing policy. As part of our membership of the CGF Forest Positive Coalition, we are working to ensure our supplier engagement, performance tracking and reporting aligns with the requirements of the CGF FPC Palm Roadmap. This includes ensuring our suppliers are assessed on their performance against the CGF's 'Forest Positive Approach'. For more information please see our Palm Oil Statement: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

### (8.7.2.20) Further details of target

*Aligned to Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action Palm Oil Roadmap*

## Palm oil

### (8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 4

### (8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

### (8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Suppliers

#### **(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)**

Select from:

- Total commodity volume associated with operations or locations covered by target

#### **(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

Engagement with Tier 1 suppliers

- % of volume from Tier 1 suppliers compliant with your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

#### **(8.7.2.8) Date target was set**

09/01/2014

#### **(8.7.2.9) End date of base year**

12/31/2014

#### **(8.7.2.10) Base year figure**

0

#### **(8.7.2.11) End date of target**

12/31/2025

#### **(8.7.2.12) Target year figure**

100

#### **(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure**

96.8

#### **(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

#### (8.7.2.15) % of target achieved relative to base year

96.80

#### (8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Other, please specify

#### (8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Target applies to all volumes procured globally by General Mills*

#### (8.7.2.18) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*As part of our effort to advance progress and aligned with sector best practice, General Mills uses the No Deforestation, No Peat, and No Exploitation Implementation Reporting Framework (NDPE-IRF)—a reporting tool designed to help companies understand and track progress in delivering palm sustainability targets, including deforestation-free supply chains. To further advance and measure progress towards No Deforestation in our palm supply chains by 2025, aligned with sector best practice, we will: Adhere to a cut-off date of December 31, 2015, in alignment with the CGF FPCoA methodology; Use the NDPE-IRF tool to report on our progress; Continue to uphold the supplier expectations outlined in General Mills' Palm Oil Policy, including: 1) No development of High Conservation Value (HCV) areas and/or High Carbon Stock (HCS) forests; 2) No development on peat lands regardless of depth, and use of best management practices for existing plantations on peat; 3) No burning for new planting or replanting preparation. We will track progress to our target using the CGF FPCoA methodology. And we will engage strategically with all direct palm suppliers to ensure implementation of this commitment through: Traceability to palm production; Confirmation of no deforestation at origin since the cutoff date; Continuous monitoring for deforestation; Action if deforestation is identified; and suppliers reporting progress to General Mills annually via the NDPE-IRF tool. For more details please see our No Deforestation Statement: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/no-deforestation-policy> and our Palm Oil Statement <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*

#### (8.7.2.20) Further details of target

*Aligned to Consumer Goods Forum Forest Positive Coalition of Action Palm Oil Roadmap and NDPE-IRF  
[Add row]*

**(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.**

**Palm oil**

### **(8.8.1) Traceability system**

Select from:

Yes

### **(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system**

Select all that apply

Value chain mapping

### **(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system**

*In 2017, General Mills began actively engaging its direct suppliers in review of their level of alignment with, and progress in implementing, our sustainable sourcing principles. This engagement is being conducted using Proforest, in which Proforest conducts a supplier risk assessment and engaged with our palm oil suppliers. The aim is to build an accurate picture of how our suppliers are performing and where there may be gaps or opportunities for improvement across our key sourcing principles. This information is then fed into our annual supplier review process. Highlighted KPIs from our 2023 Supplier scorecard include: 8 of our 9 suppliers (98% of volumes) have in place a public NDPE policy/commitment, 9/9 suppliers (100% of volumes) are reporting volumes progress through the NDPE-IRF profile, 8/9 suppliers (98% of volumes) have in place a mechanism to identify and respond to palm grievances. 7/9 suppliers (83% of volumes) are supporting initiatives delivering forest positive development at landscape and/or sectoral level.*

*[Fixed row]*

**(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.**

**Palm oil**

### **(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit**

90

**(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit**

9

**(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit**

1

**(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin**

0

**(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin**

0

**(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported**

100.00

[Fixed row]

**(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.**

**Palm oil**

**(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity**

Select from:

Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

**(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year**

**(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance**

16

**(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit**

0

**(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area**

100

**(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?**

Select from:

 No

[Fixed row]

**(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.**

	Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance	% of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance	Comment
Palm oil	Forest management unit/Producer certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RSPO producer/grower certification	16	16% of General Mills volumes are RSPO Segregated

[Add row]

**(8.9.4) Provide details of the sourcing area monitoring used to determine deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of volumes since specified cutoff date.**

## **Palm oil**

**(8.9.4.1) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of deforestation and conversion within the sourcing area**

100.00

**(8.9.4.2) Monitoring approach used for determining that sourcing areas have no or negligible risk of deforestation or conversion**

Select all that apply

Pre-existing current and credible risk profiles/indexes

**(8.9.4.3) Description of approach, including frequency of assessment**

*General Mills uses the No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation- Implementation Reporting Framework (NDPE-IRF) Delivering category to track and measure progress towards No Deforestation and No Peatland Conversion in our palm oil supply chain, with support from experts at Proforest. We prepare and publish our IRF profile annually, leveraging the IRF profiles of our Tier 1 palm suppliers.*

**(8.9.4.4) Countries/areas of origin**

Select all that apply

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peru      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colombia  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brazil    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Honduras  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mexico    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Malaysia  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Panama    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thailand  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cambodia  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guatemala |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indonesia |   |

- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Papua New Guinea

#### **(8.9.4.5) Sourcing areas**

*Our public palm oil mill list includes the geographic location of the palm mills in our supply chain.*

#### **(8.9.4.6) DF/DCF status is verified**

*Select from:*

- Yes

#### **(8.9.4.7) Type of verification**

*Select all that apply*

- First party
- Second party

#### **(8.9.4.8) % of your disclosure volume that is both determined as DF/DCF through sourcing area monitoring and is verified as DF/DCF**

100

#### **(8.9.4.9) Explain the process of verifying DF/DCF status**

*The NDPE Implementation Reporting Framework, or NDPE IRF, is a reporting tool that provides a shared and consistent view of progress towards NDPE commitments across a full supply base of companies in a supply chain. For more information please visit the NDPE website: <https://www.ndpe-irf.net/>. Working with our suppliers, we were able to create a baseline of current performance in our supply chain using the NDP IRF. For 2024, 9/9 of our Tier 1 suppliers were able to provide us with full profiles for performance on no deforestation and peatland development for the volumes supplied to General Mills.*

#### **(8.9.4.10) Attachment of verification (optional)**

*General Mills - ndp\_irf\_ Sep.15.2025.pdf*

### (8.9.4.11) Use of risk classification

The NDP-IRF profile is separated into the following 5 categories: Known Origin; Awareness; Commitment & Starting Action; Progressing; and Delivering. For more information please visit the NDPE website: <https://www.ndpe-irf.net/>.

[Fixed row]

### (8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint	Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint	Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint
Palm oil	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No standardized procedure	<i>We plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the near future.</i>

[Fixed row]

### (8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Palm oil	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

**(8.11.1) Provide details of actions taken in the reporting year to assess and increase production/sourcing of deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) volumes.**

**Palm oil**

**(8.11.1.1) Action type**

Select from:

- Working with non-compliant suppliers

**(8.11.1.2) % of disclosure volume that is covered by this action**

14

**(8.11.1.3) Indicate whether you had any major barriers or challenges related to this action in the reporting year**

Select from:

- No

**(8.11.1.5) Provide further details on the actions taken, their contribution to achieving DCF status, and any related barriers or challenges**

*With support from expert partners at Proforest, we will continue to leverage an annual supplier engagement process designed to evaluate the progress of our direct palm suppliers in meeting the principles set out in our palm oil sourcing policy. As part of our membership of the CGF Forest Positive Coalition, we are working to ensure our supplier engagement, performance tracking and reporting aligns with the requirements of the CGF FPC Palm Roadmap. This includes ensuring our suppliers are assessed on their performance against the CGF's 'Forest Positive Approach'. For more information please see our Palm Oil Statement: <https://www.generalmills.com/how-we-make-it/healthier-planet/sustainable-and-responsible-sourcing/palm-oil>*  
[Add row]

**(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.**

	Third-party certification scheme adopted	Certification details are available for the volumes sold to any requesting CDP Supply Chain members
Palm oil	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

**(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?**

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated
Palm oil	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, but not willing to share details with requesting CDP Supply Chain members

[Fixed row]

**(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.**

#### **(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations**

*Select from:*

Yes, from suppliers

#### **(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered**

Select all that apply

- Labor rights
- Land use rights
- Third parties' rights
- Environmental protection
- Human rights protected under international law
- Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations
- Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting
- The principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

### (8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

- Supplier self-declaration

### (8.14.5) Please explain

As we continue to monitor and respond to evolving legal and regulatory landscapes around the world, we will continue to prioritize legal compliance with forest regulations, most notably EU Deforestation Regulation, among others.

[Fixed row]

### (8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

	<b>Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives</b>
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

[Fixed row]

**(8.15.1) Indicate the criteria you consider when prioritizing landscapes and jurisdictions for engagement in collaborative approaches to sustainable land use and provide an explanation.**

### **(8.15.1.1) Criteria for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement**

*Select all that apply*

- Commodity sourcing footprint
- Opportunity for increased human well-being in area
- Opportunity to protect and restore natural ecosystems
- Risk of deforestation, forests/land degradation, or conversion of other natural ecosystems
- Supply of commodities strategically important

### **(8.15.1.2) Explain your process for prioritizing landscapes/jurisdictions for engagement**

*We are pleased to partner with Musim Mas to invest in a smallholder hub program focused on improving the economic security of smallholders and assisting smallholders on their journey towards sustainable production, through collaboration with local government, in Aceh Singkil, Indonesia. This landscape engagement was selected due to our commodity sourcing footprint, location close to the natural Leuser Ecosystem and opportunity for increased human well-being in the area. Investment from General Mills will support the hiring of village extension officers who will provide good agricultural practice, financial literacy and NDPE training and resources to smallholders.*

*[Fixed row]*

**(8.15.2) Provide details of your engagement with landscape/jurisdictional initiatives to sustainable land use during the reporting year.**

**Row 1**

### **(8.15.2.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID**

*Select from:*

- LJ1

### **(8.15.2.2) Name of initiative**

### (8.15.2.3) Country/area

Select from:

Indonesia

### (8.15.2.4) Name of landscape or jurisdiction area

*Aceh Singkil*

### (8.15.2.5) Attach public information about the initiative (optional)

*2025 General Mills Global Responsibility Report.pdf*

### (8.15.2.6) Indicate if you can provide the size of the area covered by the initiative

Select from:

No, area is unknown

### (8.15.2.8) Type of engagement

Select all that apply

Convener: Leads or facilitates the design, set-up, and high-level management of the initiative

Partner: Shares responsibility with other stakeholders to manage and implement actions.

Funder: Provides full or partial financial resources

### (8.15.2.9) Engagement start year

*2020*

### (8.15.2.10) Engagement end year

Select from:

Not defined

### (8.15.2.11) Estimated investment over the project period

300000

### (8.15.2.12) Landscape goals supported by engagement

Environmental

- Avoided deforestation/conversion of other natural ecosystems and/or decreased degradation rate

Production

- Increased adoption of sustainable production practices (e.g., input use efficiency and water management practices)
- Uptake of regenerative agriculture (e.g., agroforestry) practices

### (8.15.2.13) Organization actions supporting initiative

Participate in planning and multi-stakeholder alignment

- Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for deforestation, natural ecosystem conversion and/or degradation
- Collaborate on establishing and managing monitoring system for livelihoods and human well-being

Support and incentivize sustainable production and community land use practices

- Capacity building for farmers, smallholders and local communities to implement good agricultural practices (including improved efficiency, crop diversification and adoption of certification)

### (8.15.2.14) Type of partners engaged in the initiative design and implementation

*Select all that apply*

- Sub-national government
- Local communities
- NGO and/or civil society
- Producers
- Private sector

### (8.15.2.15) Description of engagement

*General Mills is currently engaged in a three-year landscape initiative with Musim Mas Group in Aceh Singkil, Indonesia. The Smallholder Hub program is designed to integrate independent smallholders from villages neighboring the Leuser Ecosystem into the sustainable palm oil supply chain to reduce deforestation by building capacity and improving livelihoods. In consultation with non-governmental and private sector entities, this area was chosen due to its proximity to the protected forest, remote geography and subsequent ability to focus on multi-stakeholder goals of conservation and positive inclusion of smallholder farmers. We are pleased to partner with Musim Mas focused on improving the economic security of smallholders and assisting them on their journey towards sustainable production, through collaboration with local government. Financial investment from General Mills supports the hiring and training of village extension officers who provide good agricultural practice, financial literacy and NDPE training and resources to smallholders. In 2024, the program trained 75 village and extension officers who provided support to nearly 2620 smallholders in 6 priority villages and beyond.*

### (8.15.2.16) Collective monitoring framework used to measure progress towards landscape goals and actions

Select from:

Yes, progress is monitored using an internally defined framework

### (8.15.2.17) State the achievements of your engagement so far and how progress is monitored

*75 Village extension agents and 2620 smallholder farmers trained in good ag practices. Focus of training is on good ag practices with an emphasis on regenerative approaches such as frond stacking, pruning, reducing chemical herbicide use, cover crop planting and organic fertilizing. Deforestation satellite tracking provided across 56 village areas. No deforestation alerts have been reported.*

### (8.15.2.18) Claims made

Select from:

No, we are not making any claims, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Add row]

**(8.15.3) For each of your disclosed commodities, provide details on the disclosure volume from each of the landscapes/jurisdictions you engage in.**

**Row 1**

### (8.15.3.1) Landscape/jurisdiction ID

Select from:

LJ1

**(8.15.3.2) Does any of your produced and/or sourced commodity volume originate from this landscape/jurisdiction, and are you able/willing to disclose information on this volume?**

Select from:

Yes, we do produce/source from this landscape/jurisdiction, but we are not able/willing to disclose volume data

[Add row]

**(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?**

Select from:

Yes

**(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains**

**Row 1**

**(8.16.1.1) Commodity**

Select all that apply

Palm oil

**(8.16.1.2) Activities**

Select all that apply

Involved in industry platforms

**(8.16.1.3) Country/area**

Select from:

Worldwide

#### (8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

Not applicable

#### (8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

*As part of our environmental strategy, we aim to eliminate deforestation and the resulting effects on biodiversity, endangered species, farmer livelihoods, climate change and more. This includes regularly review our global footprint and are focused on ingredients that bring the most risk of deforestation and look at where we can make a meaningful impact: palm oil, cocoa, and fiber packaging. As a member of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, we actively reinforce palm oil best practices of the association. For instance, to help ensure our palm oil purchases do not contribute to deforestation, we have been sourcing 100% of our palm oil to meet RSPO standards since 2015, and we have maintained that performance through fiscal year 2024. Additionally, in order to maintain RSPO certification, we have evolved our sustainable palm sourcing activities reflecting the need to enhance our response to the complex sustainability challenges facing the sector. Recent progress areas include: - Updating our Palm Oil Policy and Statement (2014) - Engaging with direct suppliers - Monitoring forests-related commodities through the status of RSPO certified volumes and commodity traceability - Enhancing supply chain transparency - Developing an Internal Grievance Process & public tracker, and -Conducting a smallholder program in Aceh Singkil region of Indonesia Additionally, as a founding member of the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) Forest Positive Coalition of Action, we are actively reinforcing our company's key sustainable sourcing strategies with coalition members to champion changes within the industry. In 2024, the program trained 75 village and extension officers who provided support to nearly 2600 smallholders in 6 priority villages and beyond.*

[Add row]

#### **(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?**

Select from:

Yes

**(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).**

**Row 1**

### (8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

- Project 1

### (8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

- Agriculture

### (8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

- Improvement to sustainability of production practices

### (8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

- No

### (8.17.1.5) Description of project

*This voluntary project is targeted and focused on a specific part of the supply chain that requires arguably the most assistance – smallholder producers. While small, they have a big responsibility to produce sustainably. This project presents an opportunity for General Mills to make a direct impact to its supply chain, to villages and smallholders in Aceh Singkil, and reduce deforestation. General Mills will also be transforming the industry as it chooses to invest in suppliers within Aceh Singkil, an area of priority for many NGOs and FMCG companies. This project model can then be replicated in other high-priority areas. The project can demonstrate and communicate General Mills' commitment to not only source 100% sustainable palm oil year after year, but also to include smallholders in its sustainable supply chain, as outlined in its Palm Oil Policy and Statement. In addition, the risk of sourcing from Aceh Singkil could be reduced with this project as smallholders move towards more sustainable methods of cultivation. As of 2024, 75 village and extension officers have completed the program and have provided support to 2600 smallholders in six high-priority villages and beyond.*

### (8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

- Project based elsewhere

**(8.17.1.7) Start year**

2020

**(8.17.1.8) Target year**

Select from:

2024

**(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)**

0

**(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)**

0

**(8.17.1.11) Country/Area**

Select from:

Indonesia

**(8.17.1.12) Latitude**

2.358946

**(8.17.1.13) Longitude**

97.87216

**(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency**

Select from:

Annually

### (8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

300000

### (8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

Improvement to sustainability of production practice

### (8.17.1.17) Please explain

*By the end of the four-year program, General Mills will aim to train 75 village and extension officers who will provide support to over 1400 smallholders in high-priority villages. Project objectives: • To assist smallholders from the Oil Palm Industry form groups that may allow them to access a range of services provided by Government departments, NGO's and Oil Palm Companies. • To deliver focused, via the Agricultural Extension Officers, practical training to the smallholders that will better equip them to manage their oil palm blocks. • To build the capacity of Village Extension Officers and embed Agricultural skills. • To broaden the smallholders' knowledge and skills about Good Agricultural Practices leading to improved production and quality of the crop. • Via increased production, improve the economic and social conditions experienced by the smallholders. • Inform smallholders of land certification processes and act as a conduit to organizations that may be able to assist them in achieving certification. • Increase the knowledge of smallholders about environmental issues and provide advice and training to improve sustainable agricultural practices used. • To educate and help Smallholder implement NDPE • To map the location of smallholders • To further strengthen the relationship with key stakeholders in the supply chain. • To ensure alternative livelihoods or alternative incomes are considered. The smallholders who participate in this program will also be exposed to agricultural practices that follow ISPO / RSPO guidelines. With the ever-growing pressure from the international community for Oil Palm producers to follow environmental instructions that meet ISPO / RSPO standards and NDPE, it is increasingly essential to lead smallholders onto the path of GAP incorporating sustainable methods. Systematically smallholders will be encouraged to implement processes that will assist them in gaining some form of environmental certification. The minimum base will be adherence to NDPE. General Mills monitors improvements to sustainability through the two-year sustainability training program by documenting the number of smallholders who have completed the program*

[Add row]

## C9. Environmental performance - Water security

### (9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

##### Row 1

##### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

Facilities

##### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*Exclusions include non-Minneapolis (headquarters) sales offices and R&D locations, warehouses, grain elevators, and owned Haagen Dazs shops.*

##### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

Small volume [rainwater]

##### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

Less than 1%

##### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

*Excluded locations under General Mills' direct control are very small facilities with relatively low, insignificant water use that makes up less than 1% of General Mills' overall water withdrawal when combined. Therefore these sites are considered immaterial and have been excluded.*

*[Add row]*

## **(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?**

### **Water withdrawals – total volumes**

#### **(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

100%

#### **(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

*Select from:*

Monthly

#### **(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Water withdrawals - total volumes are measured monthly via water meter and utility report.*

#### **(9.2.4) Please explain**

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities must see to minimize water usage and consider water conservation opportunities when adding new operations or making process changes. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data (including water withdrawals - total volumes), which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. Facilities also record data on water withdrawal volume per metric ton of production, enabling us to track and optimize water efficiency. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.*

### **Water withdrawals – volumes by source**

#### **(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water withdrawals - volumes by source are measured monthly via water meter and utility report.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities identify and document source(s) of water entering or consumed at the site and must consider alternative water withdrawals - volumes by source, such as storm water, recycling and reuse when appropriate, such as for cooling or cleaning. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data (including water withdrawals - total volumes), which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.*

## Water withdrawals quality

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Our Food Quality & Safety team has site-specific measurement approaches for testing water quality when water is used as a food ingredient.*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities assess incoming water to ensure it is safe for human consumption and does not have any attributes that would affect product quality or process equipment. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data (including water withdrawals quality), which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation*

### Water discharges – total volumes

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

#### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

#### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water discharges - total volumes are measured monthly via water meter and utility report.*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities must identify all water discharge sources and characterize them. Process water discharge stream(s) must be physically characterized for items such as, but not limited to total volume and solids content. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data, which measures this water aspect using continuous onsite metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.*

### Water discharges – volumes by destination

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water discharges - volumes by destination are measured monthly via water meter and utility report.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities must identify all water discharge sources and characterize them. Process water discharge stream(s) must be physically characterized for items such as, but not limited to total volume and solids content. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data (including volumes by destination), which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.*

## Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water discharges - volumes by treatment method are measured monthly via on-site testing, per treatment method plan.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facility assessment establishes treatment need and options. Facilities record volumes treated for chemical oxygen demand; biological oxygen demand; filtration of total suspended solids; & filtration of fats, oils & grease. Plants track discharge volume by treatment method to ensure plants compliance with all local regulations. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data, which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.*

## Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water discharges - quality by standard effluent parameters are measured monthly via on-site testing, per treatment method plan.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities must assess process water effluent to determine if volume and contaminant levels (if any) are acceptable to discharge based upon laws, permits or best professional judgment. This assessment includes physical and chemical characterization. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data, which measures*

*this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.*

## **Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)**

### **(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

Select from:

Not relevant

### **(9.2.4) Please explain**

*We do not manufacture products containing nitrates, phosphates, pesticides and/or other priority substances. Therefore we have selected not relevant.*

## **Water discharge quality – temperature**

### **(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

Select from:

100%

### **(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

Select from:

Monthly

### **(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Plants that have water treatment related to temperature on-site track and trend temperature using outfall pH probes or dedicated temperature probes, or with a grab sample.*

### **(9.2.4) Please explain**

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. Facilities must assess process water effluent to determine if temperature is acceptable to discharge based upon laws, permits or best professional judgment. Discharge temperature requirements are listed in the plant's*

wastewater permit and/or the local wastewater ordinance and differs from plant to plant. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data, which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.

## Water consumption – total volume

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water consumption - total volume is measured by subtracting metered discharge from metered withdrawal and multiplied by tons of product produced, for visibility to the m3/ton efficiency rate of the plant.

### (9.2.4) Please explain

We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data (in order to calculate water consumption – total volume), which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. Facilities also record data on water withdrawal volume per metric ton of production, enabling us to track and optimize water efficiency and compare to water discharge volumes to ascertain how production levels impact total water consumption. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation.

## Water recycled/reused

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

## (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

## (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Plants recycling water track use based on volume required for the destination of the recycled water, for example, recycling line cleaning water for use as air scrubbing cereal dust from exhaust chimneys.*

## (9.2.4) Please explain

*We regularly measure and monitor these aspects so we can proactively manage our water footprint. Since FY21, our water strategy has focused on continuous improvement and holistic evaluation approach of water conservation opportunities, by facility. In 2014 we replaced manual tracking with GSTEMS, an enterprise-wide system that gathers water withdrawal and discharge data (including water recycled/reused), which measures this water aspect using continuous on-site metering from all our facilities on a monthly basis and enables rapid reporting and analysis. This data is backed up by utility invoices, laboratory reports or other similar documentation. For example, per our strategy plants must consider water conservation opportunities, and seek discharge opportunities that help us recycle/reuse the water nearby to reduce other locations' water consumption, like our Murfreesboro yogurt plant that discharges water to irrigate a golf course.*

## The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Food Safety & Quality Team monitoring, Violations reporting to Ethics & Compliance hotline/email, facility audits.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*As a food manufacturer, sanitation for workers is critical to our success. We require workers entering the facility to wash hands properly and we provide fullyfunctioning WASH services for employees while on duty. Employee hygiene activities, chemicals and hygiene facilities are inspected daily to ensure food safety. Per our Human Rights Policy, we work to maintain safe and healthy working conditions within our facilities. We audit our facilities using third parties every three years against our responsible sourcing criteria which is inclusive of our Policy on Human Rights. Auditors review water quality for employee consumption and product manufacture, basic sanitation facilities are available for workers and proper practices are in place for hygiene protect food products and employees themselves. The plant Food Safety & Quality Manager is accountable for developing effective personnel practices and hygiene practices consistent with our safety and sanitary design standards.*

*[Fixed row]*

## **(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?**

### **Total withdrawals**

#### **(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)**

8965

#### **(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

#### **(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

#### **(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast**

Select from:

About the same

#### **(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast**

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*In FY 2024, absolute water withdrawals related to our manufacturing processes equaled 8965 megaliters, 7% less than in the previous year when we reported total consumption of 9625 megaliters. As we grow our business, we expect water withdrawals to increase but as we improve efficiency across the supply chain the rate per unit of product will decrease. We are tracking megaliters/tonne of product to understand efficiency and observe how changes in our portfolio mix impact water intensity. In fiscal 2024, the average water usage rate (mL/tonne of production) at our production facilities remained flat. The reduction in discharge was primarily driven by production volume decline.*

## Total discharges

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

5874

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*In FY 2024, absolute water discharges related to our manufacturing processes equaled 5874 megaliters, 10% less than in the previous year when we reported total consumption of 6497 megaliters. As we grow our business, we expect water withdrawals to increase but as we improve efficiency across the supply chain the rate per unit of product will decrease. We are tracking megaliters/tonne of product to understand efficiency and observe how changes in our portfolio mix impact water intensity. In fiscal 2024, the average water usage rate (mL/tonne of production) at our production facilities remained flat. The reduction in discharge was primarily driven by production volume decline.*

## Total consumption

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

3091

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Lower

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

- About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*In FY 2024, absolute water consumption related to our manufacturing processes equaled 3091 megaliters, 9% less than in the previous year when we reported total consumption of 3379 megaliters. As we grow our business, we expect water withdrawals to increase but as we improve efficiency across the supply chain the rate per unit of product will decrease. We are tracking megaliters/tonne of product to understand efficiency and observe how changes in our portfolio mix impact water intensity. In fiscal 2024, the average water usage rate (mL/tonne of production) at our production facilities remained flat. The reduction in discharge was primarily driven by production volume decline.*

*[Fixed row]*

### (9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

#### (9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

8693

#### (9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

#### (9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

- About the same

#### (9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

96.97

#### (9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

- WRI Aqueduct
- WWF Water Risk Filter
- Other, please specify :McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter

#### (9.2.4.9) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment included 46 owned sites, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. Each plant is scored 1-5; if any plant receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a withdrawal from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. Because of these newer, more stringent assessment criteria, the majority of our water withdrawals are now deemed to be from an area of water stress. Changes were due to production shifts at facilities in these high stress areas. In future, we anticipate that investments at the plant level to improve efficiency and in upper watershed programs to reduce overall basin risk will balance the anticipated growth of the company and make our 5-year forecast "about the same".*

[Fixed row]

**(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?**

## Coffee

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

No, but we intend to obtain this data within the next two years

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*We are currently updating our watershed prioritization, including review of all ingredient sourcing locations and water stress. This will allow us to report on the volume of coffee sourced from areas of water stress in future years. However, we only source minimal volumes of coffee for our Haagen Dazs ice cream brand in Europe. The process will be the same as for other reported ingredients: Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question.*

## Dairy and egg products

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. We prioritize four watersheds in which dairy or eggs are sourced: Great Lakes, St. Lawrence, Escault, and Mississippi-Missouri. In this assessment, 82% of dairy and 100% of eggs by volume were sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category

## Maize/corn

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. In this assessment, 87% of corn by volume were sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category. Our work to address water risk related to our corn supply includes our regenerative agriculture advancement in the Great Lakes corn belt, for both human consumption and animal feeds. For example, General Mills funds 1:1 coaching for 32 dairy

farmers that includes feed crop (maize), to advance soil health impacts of cover crops, reduced tillage and fertilizer optimization, practices which have water quality co-benefits. Additionally, some of our regenerative agriculture pilots (e.g. sugarbeets and maize in the Red River Valley) demonstrate water benefits, e.g. decreased agricultural runoff through improved nitrogen efficiency.

## Nuts

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

51-75

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. We prioritize one watershed, San Joaquin-Sacramento, in which nuts (almonds) are sourced. In this assessment, 66% of almonds and 60% of other nuts by volume were sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category. Lärabar, a General Mills brand, funded three years of research with the Ecdysis Foundation in California's San Joaquin Valley to determine how on-farm practices are linked to regenerative outcomes for water, soil health, crop yield and more. General Mills also funds research with UC Davis on water balance in almond orchards to understand whether regenerative orchards use less water than conventional orchards. Early results show growing almonds with regenerative agriculture principles improves soil health and increases water infiltration rates, which can lead to potential reductions in irrigation — and ultimately more water resilience and less risk in the face of both drought and flood.

## Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. We prioritize two watersheds, Mississippi-Missouri and Saskatchewan-Nelson, in which oats (other grains) are sourced. In this assessment, 93% of oats by volume were sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category.*

## Palm oil

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

51-75

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. In this assessment, 71% of Palm Oil by volume were sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category. Rainforest deforestation from palm has implications for the global water cycle. In 2010, we made a commitment to source 100% of our palm oil from responsible and sustainable sources. This goal was achieved in 2015 through the purchase of RSPO certified volumes and we have continued to maintain that performance year on year. We source 100% RSPO palm and collaborate with Musim Mas to provide extension to smallholders to reduce deforestation (NDPE - No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation). In 2024, General Mills committed to No Deforestation across its primary deforestation-linked commodities — palm, cocoa, & fiber (pulp & paper) packaging — with a target date of December 31, 2025. The cut-off date for palm is December 31, 2015.

## Sugar

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI

was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. We prioritize two watersheds, Mississippi-Missouri and Southeast Coast of the US (Florida/Georgia), in which sugar is sourced. In this assessment, 88% of beet sugar and 89% of cane sugar by volume were sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category.

## Wheat

### (9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

### (9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.6.3) Please explain

Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations where we have traceability to origin; without traceability, global crop data from IFPRI was used to estimate and proportionately allocate volume to basin. Each ingredient sourcing location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as a sourcing from an area with water stress for the purpose of this question. We prioritize two watersheds, Mississippi-Missouri and Ganga, in which wheat is sourced. In this assessment, 94% of wheat by volume was sourced from a location receiving a high risk rating in at least one category.  
[Fixed row]

### (9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

**Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes**

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Due to facility closure, we did not have plants that withdrew fresh surface water (rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes) in the reporting year, therefore we have selected "not relevant."*

## Brackish surface water/Seawater

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*We do not withdraw brackish surface/seawater and therefore it is not relevant.*

## Groundwater – renewable

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1189

### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

#### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*We withdrew about 25% less groundwater – renewable than last reporting year when we reported 879 megaliters. This change was primarily driven by production volume decline. Groundwater – renewable is relevant because we withdraw groundwater at 8 of 44 sites compliant with local regulations. We expect similar small year-on-year fluctuations in the future. Volume totals are reported for operations under direct control, including manufacturing sites and headquarters. This was primarily driven by a withdrawal increase at one of our Brazil plants that does not have access to other water sources.*

### Groundwater – non-renewable

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*By our evaluation we do not withdraw non-renewable groundwater and therefore it is not relevant.*

### Produced/Entrained water

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*We do not consider the total water withdrawal from produced/entrained water to be relevant, as we do not have processes that withdraw water from that source.*

## Third party sources

### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

7776

### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*We withdrew about 9% less water from third party sources than last reporting year when we reported 8530 megaliters. This change was primarily driven by production volume decline. Third party sources are relevant because we withdraw groundwater at 40 of 44 sites compliant with local regulations. We expect similar small year-on-year fluctuations in the future. Volume totals are reported for operations under direct control, including manufacturing sites and headquarters.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

### Fresh surface water

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

974

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*This is relevant because 4 of 44 sites discharge to fresh surface water in accordance with local regulation. In these locations, the third-party (municipality) is not equipped to manage our discharges. We discharged less surface water than last reporting year (8% less), when we reported 1055 megaliters. This change was primarily driven by production volume decline. We expect similar small year-on-year fluctuations in the future as production moves from site to site or we invest or divest in businesses, but generally expect an overall increase as we grow our business. As we improve efficiency as we grow, we expect the volume per unit of production to decrease. Volume totals are reported for operations under direct control, including manufacturing sites and headquarters.*

## Brackish surface water/seawater

### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*We do not discharge to brackish surface/seawater and therefore it is not relevant.*

## Groundwater

### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

362

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*This is land application/septic system discharges. We selected relevant because 5 of 44 sites discharge to groundwater in accordance with local regulation, where the municipality is not equipped to manage our discharges or we have found a mutually beneficial arrangement for land application, like our Murfreesboro, TN plant which discharges a significant percentage of wastewater to irrigate a golf course. This change was primarily driven by production volume decline. We discharged 19% less than the previous reporting year when we reported 446 megaliters, though the overall volume remains low compared to our total discharge volume. We expect similar small yearly fluctuations in the future as production moves from site to site or we invest or divest in businesses, but generally expect an overall increase as we grow our business.*

## Third-party destinations

### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

4538

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*We discharged about 9% less water to third-party (municipal) destinations than last reporting year when we reported 5009. This change was primarily driven by production volume decline. This is relevant because 23 of 44 sites discharge to third-party destinations in accordance with local regulations. We expect similar small year-on-year fluctuations in the future as production moves from site to site or we invest or divest in businesses, but generally expect an overall increase as we grow our business. As we improve efficiency as we grow, we expect the volume per unit of production to decrease.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

### Tertiary treatment

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

**(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year**

Select from:

 Lower**(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

 Increase/decrease in business activity**(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to**

Select from:

 1-10**(9.2.9.6) Please explain**

*5 of 44 sites practice tertiary treatment. All of our facilities discharge in accordance with local regulations (for example, in accordance with US EPA Effluent Guidelines in the United States). Plants also monitor for contaminants to comply with local regulations for fats, oils and grease; total suspended solids; biological oxygen demand; and chemical oxygen demand to ensure treatment protocols result in compliance with local regulations. For tertiary treatment, plants use on-site chemical treatment prior to discharging. Tertiary treatment is used to treat discharge to remove remaining nutrients and other contaminants suspended in wastewater following secondary treatment to ensure that discharges are properly filtered. We selected "about the same" because plants advance this treatment method and volume internally in order to comply with local discharge regulations. Year over year change in tertiary treatment volume is • recording process conditions (e.g., pH or temperature) Control device equipment and associated monitoring gauges must be inspected regularly and calibrated as appropriate and be part of a preventative maintenance program. Reduction is primarily driven by production volume decrease.*

**Secondary treatment****(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge**

Select from:

 Relevant**(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

**(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year**

Select from:

 Higher**(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

 Increase/decrease in business activity**(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to**

Select from:

 21-30**(9.2.9.6) Please explain**

*11 of 44 sites practice secondary treatment. All our facilities discharge in accordance with local regulations (for example, in accordance with US EPA Effluent Guidelines in the United States). Plants also monitor for contaminants to comply with local regulations for fats, oils and grease; total suspended solids; biological oxygen demand; and chemical oxygen demand to ensure treatment protocols result in compliance with local regulations. For secondary treatment, plants use on-site biological treatment prior to discharging. Secondary treatment is used to treat discharge to remove remaining nutrients and other contaminants suspended in wastewater following primary treatment to ensure that discharges are properly filtered. Our reported volume on secondary treatment is different from the previous reporting year due to site-specific wastewater volume reduction. Plants advance water treatment methods internally in order to comply with local discharge regulations. General Mills policy is that all any facility with water treatment and control systems must develop a program to ensure the control is implemented and operates properly and effectively. The program should include monitoring to insure the control device operates as designed or the work practice is being followed. Water treatment and control effectiveness should be documented and may be done by: • Observation • periodic measurement • recording process conditions (e.g., pH or temperature) Control device equipment and associated monitoring gauges must be inspected regularly and calibrated as appropriate and be part of a preventative maintenance program.*

**Primary treatment only****(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge**

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1799

### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

21-30

### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*11 of 44 sites practice primary treatment only. All our facilities discharge in accordance with local regulations (for example, in accordance with US EPA Effluent Guidelines in the United States). Plants also monitor for contaminants to comply with local regulations for fats, oils and grease; total suspended solids; biological oxygen demand; and chemical oxygen demand to ensure treatment protocols result in compliance with local regulations. For primary treatment, plants use mechanisms such as grease traps and dissolved air flotation (DAF) to remove suspended solids prior to discharging. Plants practicing only primary treatment have determined that only one stage of treatment is necessary, based on this evaluation criteria, determining that the only contaminants are large suspended solids that are able to be removed through primary treatment mechanisms such as grease traps and DAF. The reported volume increased in FY23 compared to FY22 due to increased data availability. Plants advance treatment methods internally in order to comply with local discharge regulations. General Mills policy is that all any facility with water treatment and control systems must develop a program to ensure the control is implemented and operates properly and effectively. The program should include monitoring to insure the control device operates as designed or the work practice is being followed. Water treatment and control effectiveness should be documented and may be done by: • Observation • periodic measurement • recording process conditions (e.g., pH or temperature) Control device equipment and associated monitoring gauges must be inspected regularly and calibrated as appropriate and be part of a preventative maintenance program. The changes were primarily driven by production volume fluctuations at the plants.*

## Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Not relevant

### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*No plants reported discharging to the environment without treatment, so we have selected not relevant.*

## Discharge to a third party without treatment

### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1389

### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*8 of 44 sites discharges to a third party without treatment. All our facilities discharge in accordance with local regulations (for example, in accordance with US EPA Effluent Guidelines in the United States). In these cases, the local municipality is able to treat wastewater from our plant without pre-treatment on-site. It can also be a benefit to the local water municipality for microbe management: for example, General Mills' Albuquerque plant considered adding on-site treatment, but the local municipality requested that we continue to discharge without treatment as the plant's slurry from manufacturing cereal and bars contains sugar, cereal dust, bits of oats, and other beneficial feed for the treatment plant's microbes. Our reported volume on untreated municipal discharge is within 10% of last year's reported volume - a year over year change that we consider to be "about the same". General Mills policy is that any facility with water treatment and control systems must develop a program to ensure the control is implemented and operates properly and effectively. The program should include monitoring to insure the control device operates as designed or the work practice is being followed. Water treatment and control effectiveness should be documented and may be done by: • Observation • periodic measurement • recording process conditions (e.g., pH or temperature) Control device equipment and associated monitoring gauges must be inspected regularly and calibrated as appropriate and be part of a preventative maintenance program. We selected "about the same" because the total was only 10 ML lower than the previous reporting year (1399ML), and we anticipate minor fluctuations due to business activity in the future.*

### Other

### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Relevant

### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

144

### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

11-20

### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*Water treatment data was not yet available for the remainder of our plants (8 sites) to reported in the above responses (tertiary, secondary, primary only, discharge to the natural environment without treatment, or discharge to a third party without treatment), therefore we have reported the remaining volume in "other", though we know that they do fall into one of the above categories. However, the reported volume for these sites is very low compared to the remainder of our facilities' reported wastewater volumes. In FY23, we vastly improved our data availability for wastewater treatment methods, decreasing the "Other" volume from 2198 ML in FY22 to just 144 ML in FY24. We anticipate that this category will be removed in future reporting years as our data collection methodology continues to improve. All our facilities discharge in accordance with local regulations (for example, in accordance with US EPA Effluent Guidelines in the United States).*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

### Direct operations

#### (9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

#### (9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

32

#### (9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

51-75

### (9.3.4) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts, including to gain insight into water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities (DIROs) for our owned operations. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF,, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading, and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations for owned facilities. Each facility location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as being located in an area with water stress for the purpose of this question, which we equate with a DIRO. As a food company, we use water for site sanitation (e.g. line cleaning), employee WASH, and as an ingredient, so water is typically a DIRO for our owned operations. In the following question, we are only reporting on the facilities prioritized for action at the plant itself, as all other activities to address water DIROs are activated through our upstream value chain engagement in our sourcing supply sheds. We anticipate, via our theory of change, that this will ultimately benefit the plants in the same watersheds in the form of a more stable local water cycle.*

## Upstream value chain

### (9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

### (9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

83

### (9.3.4) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts, including to gain insight into water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities (DIROs) for our contract manufacturers and sourcing regions (supply sheds). (Note: The number reported (83) is the number of contract manufacturers with a water DIRO in our most recent assessment, but we also assessed sourcing locations. We have not reported this number because many of those locations are estimated based on global crop production data from IFPRI.) This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF,, using Steps 1 and 2 (Assess and Prioritize) from the Science Based Target for Freshwater guidance. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, which were assessed on six water quantity and quality indicators: water depletion, baseline water stress, blue water scarcity, surface water quality, nutrient loading,*

and coastal eutrophication potential using aggregate scores from WRI Aqueduct, WWF Water Risk Filter, McDowell's Nutrient Loading Database, and WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter. To determine basin, we used real lat/long for locations for contract manufacturers' facilities. Each facility location is scored 1-5; if any location receives a 4 or 5 (high risk) in any category, then we are reporting it as being located in an area with water stress for the purpose of this question, which we equate with a DIRO. As a food company, our contract manufacturers use water for site sanitation (e.g. line cleaning), employee WASH, and as an ingredient, so water is typically a DIRO for our contract manufacturers' operations.

[Fixed row]

**(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.**

**Row 1**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 1

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

Arras

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Risks

Opportunities

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

France

Schelde (Escaut)

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.27874

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

2.82952

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

194

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

194

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

115

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

115

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

76

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*We are reporting on this location because action at the plant level has been prioritized to address one of their primary risk/opportunity, water regulatory readiness. In F24, the Arras plant set a goal to reduce average water consumption by 3% between F25-F27, to achieve 10% reduction based on their average F19-22 water consumption. We anticipate being able to report progress on this goal in future years. The plant makes ice cream, which requires proportionately higher water use than some of our other plants. They have set this goal to align with French law on water use reduction. Investments include water reuse stations for green clean-in-place (CIP) systems to reuse cleaning water and will install water counters in F25 to promote ownership and continuous improvement at the line level.*

## Row 2

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 2

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Albuquerque

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies
- Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

- Bravo

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.17681

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-106.60823

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

8

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

197

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

109

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

#### (9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

#### (9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

#### (9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

#### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

109

#### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

96

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*We are reporting on this location because action at the plant level has been prioritized to address their dependency/risk, regional water scarcity. The Albuquerque plant has been AWS certified since F21. As part of the certification, they work toward continuous improvement for water consumption. The plant also engages with the local community in New Mexico, such as donating used totes to local indigenous pueblos for water storage in areas with poor WASH access. They also engage with The Nature Conservancy to advance the Rio Grande Water Fund, which protects the upper watershed of the Rio Grande/Bravo River, the primary water source for Albuquerque. The city experienced a water disruption in 2011, when a catastrophic wildfire and subsequent ash flow into the river caused the city to cease water*

*withdrawals for 40 days while the debris precipitated out of the reservoir. This water event demonstrated an important DIRO for the plant and has increased community engagement around water and led to the implementation the AWS standard. We anticipate continued improvement in water consumption in future years. [Add row]*

### **(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?**

#### **Water withdrawals – total volumes**

##### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

##### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water withdrawal volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

#### **Water withdrawals – volume by source**

##### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

##### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water withdrawal volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

#### **Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters**

##### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water withdrawal volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

## **Water discharges – total volumes**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water discharge volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

## **Water discharges – volume by destination**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water discharge volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

## **Water discharges – volume by final treatment level**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water discharge volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

## **Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water discharge volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*

## **Water consumption – total volume**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

### **(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Documentation of plant reported water consumption volume has not been reviewed by a third party, therefore we have selected "not verified".*  
*[Fixed row]*

## **(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?**

Select from:

Yes, CDP supply chain members buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

### **(9.4.1) Indicate which of the facilities referenced in 9.3.1 could impact a requesting CDP supply chain member.**

## Row 1

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 2

### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Albuquerque*

### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

Walmart, Inc.

### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*A municipal water disruption, due to catastrophic wildfire and subsequent ash flow into the reservoir, could result in plant down time, impacting product service delivery. We believe such a disruption is unlikely to occur because the plant has access to well water, which could fill any water gaps on a short term basis. General Mills also invests in the Nature Conservancy's Rio Grande Water Fund, which conducts upper watershed forest management and wildfire restoration. The fund's activities have been extremely successful in protecting the watershed, such as preventing a catastrophic wildfire in 2022 via forest thinning and wetland restoration (New Mexico's worst fire year on record, at the time); a wildfire started in the fund's treatment area, but burned as a low-heat, healthy fire for which the ecosystem is adapted, and did not impact the watershed with ash flow afterwards.*

### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*This is a single-location facility.*

## Row 2

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 2

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Albuquerque

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

Costco Wholesale Corporation

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*A municipal water disruption, due to catastrophic wildfire and subsequent ash flow into the reservoir, could result in plant down time, impacting product service delivery. We believe such a disruption is unlikely to occur because the plant has access to well water, which could fill any water gaps on a short term basis. General Mills also invests in the Nature Conservancy's Rio Grande Water Fund, which conducts upper watershed forest management and wildfire restoration. The fund's activities have been extremely successful in protecting the watershed, such as preventing a catastrophic wildfire in 2022 via forest thinning and wetland restoration (New Mexico's worst fire year on record, at the time); a wildfire started in the fund's treatment area, but burned as a low-heat, healthy fire for which the ecosystem is adapted, and did not impact the watershed with ash flow afterwards.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*This is a single-location facility.*

### Row 3

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 2

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Albuquerque

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

CVS Health

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*A municipal water disruption, due to catastrophic wildfire and subsequent ash flow into the reservoir, could result in plant down time, impacting product service delivery. We believe such a disruption is unlikely to occur because the plant has access to well water, which could fill any water gaps on a short term basis. General Mills also invests in the Nature Conservancy's Rio Grande Water Fund, which conducts upper watershed forest management and wildfire restoration. The fund's activities have been extremely successful in protecting the watershed, such as preventing a catastrophic wildfire in 2022 via forest thinning and wetland restoration (New Mexico's worst fire year on record, at the time); a wildfire started in the fund's treatment area, but burned as a low-heat, healthy fire for which the ecosystem is adapted, and did not impact the watershed with ash flow afterwards.*

#### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*This is a single-location facility.*

### Row 4

#### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 2

#### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

*Albuquerque*

#### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

Ahold Delhaize

#### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*A municipal water disruption, due to catastrophic wildfire and subsequent ash flow into the reservoir, could result in plant down time, impacting product service delivery. We believe such a disruption is unlikely to occur because the plant has access to well water, which could fill any water gaps on a short term basis. General Mills also invests in the Nature Conservancy's Rio Grande Water Fund, which conducts upper watershed forest management and wildfire restoration. The fund's*

*activities have been extremely successful in protecting the watershed, such as preventing a catastrophic wildfire in 2022 via forest thinning and wetland restoration (New Mexico's worst fire year on record, at the time); a wildfire started in the fund's treatment area, but burned as a low-heat, healthy fire for which the ecosystem is adapted, and did not impact the watershed with ash flow afterwards.*

#### **(9.4.1.5) Comment**

*This is a single-location facility.*

### **Row 5**

#### **(9.4.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 2

#### **(9.4.1.2) Facility name**

*Albuquerque*

#### **(9.4.1.3) Requesting member**

Select from:

Target Corporation

#### **(9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member**

*A municipal water disruption, due to catastrophic wildfire and subsequent ash flow into the reservoir, could result in plant down time, impacting product service delivery. We believe such a disruption is unlikely to occur because the plant has access to well water, which could fill any water gaps on a short term basis. General Mills also invests in the Nature Conservancy's Rio Grande Water Fund, which conducts upper watershed forest management and wildfire restoration. The fund's activities have been extremely successful in protecting the watershed, such as preventing a catastrophic wildfire in 2022 via forest thinning and wetland restoration (New Mexico's worst fire year on record, at the time); a wildfire started in the fund's treatment area, but burned as a low-heat, healthy fire for which the ecosystem is adapted, and did not impact the watershed with ash flow afterwards.*

#### **(9.4.1.5) Comment**

*This is a single-location facility.*

## Row 6

### (9.4.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 1

### (9.4.1.2) Facility name

Arras

### (9.4.1.3) Requesting member

Select from:

Ahold Delhaize

### (9.4.1.4) Description of potential impact on member

*Regulatory water restrictions could affect the plant's access to water withdrawals for sanitation such as line cleaning. We believe this impact is extremely unlikely, due to the current availability and low price of water. Additionally, the plant is investing in green clean-in-place (CIP) technology to improve water reuse and has set a target for average water reduction of 10% by 2027 from a 2019-22 baseline.*

### (9.4.1.5) Comment

*This is a single-location facility.*

[Add row]

## (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

### (9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

19900000000

## (9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

2219743.45

## (9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

*As we grow our business, we expect water withdrawals to increase but as we improve efficiency across the supply chain the rate per unit of product will decrease. We are tracking megaliters/tonne of product to understand efficiency and observe how changes in our portfolio mix impact water intensity. In fiscal 2024, the average water usage rate (mL/tonne of production) at our production facilities remained flat, but we anticipate improvements in efficiency over time as plants improve water reuse.*

*[Fixed row]*

## (9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

### Dairy & egg products

#### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

143

#### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected “about the same.” The water intensity value reported for dairy and egg products is an average of the water intensity for each commodity. We calculated dairy’s water intensity to be 63 m<sup>3</sup>/MT and eggs to be 223m<sup>3</sup>/MT. We use our water intensity metric for dairy & egg products internally to inform our sourcing strategies and our regenerative agriculture programs.*

## Maize/corn

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m<sup>3</sup>/denominator)

34

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected “about the same.” We calculated corn water intensity to be 34m<sup>3</sup>/MT. We use our water intensity metric for corn internally to inform our sourcing strategies and our regenerative agriculture programs.*

## Nuts

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m<sup>3</sup>/denominator)

1530

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected “about the same.” The water intensity value reported for nuts is an average of the water intensity for almonds (separately broken out in our analysis) and all other nuts (aggregated). We calculated almonds water intensity to be 1530 m<sup>3</sup>/MT and other nuts to be 1047 m<sup>3</sup>/MT. We use our water intensity metric for nuts internally to inform our sourcing strategies and our regenerative agriculture programs.*

### Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m<sup>3</sup>/denominator)

44

### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

#### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

#### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected “about the same.” We use our water intensity metric for grains internally to inform our sourcing strategies and our regenerative agriculture programs.*

### **Palm oil**

#### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

0.23

#### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

#### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

#### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected "about the same." We calculated palm oil water intensity to be .23 m<sup>3</sup>/MT.*

### Sugar

#### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m<sup>3</sup>/denominator)

228

#### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

#### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

#### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected “about the same.” The water intensity value reported for sugar is an average of the water intensity for beet and cane sugar. We calculated beet sugar water intensity to be 208 m<sup>3</sup>/MT and cane sugar to be 249 m<sup>3</sup>/MT.*

### Wheat

#### (9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.9.2) Water intensity value (m<sup>3</sup>/denominator)

156

#### (9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

#### (9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Metric tons

#### (9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

#### (9.9.6) Please explain

*Every three years, we assess business risk and water impact for the company to prioritize watersheds in which to focus our efforts. This ensures that our prioritization reflects changes in sourcing locations, product mix, external context and improvements in risk assessment tools, and gives us a time-bound period in which to advance progress against context-based goals. We updated this assessment in FY 23 in partnership with WWF. The assessment evaluated 108 major basins and 48 direct materials across our ingredient and packaging supply chains, and included blue water footprint (water withdrawals) data based on global water withdrawal data by region. To calculate water efficiency for each sourced commodity, we took the sum of total blue water footprint (numerator) divided by the sum of total metric tons of volume sourced (denominator). Because our sourcing footprint has not changed significantly and because we do not directly calculate water intensity by supplier, we assume that efficiency has not changed since the previous year, and therefore have selected "about the same."*

[Add row]

### (9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

#### (9.13.1) Products contain hazardous substances

Select from:

No

#### (9.13.2) Comment

*General Mills makes human and pet food. We adhere to the highest safety food safety standards, in accordance with legal regulations where our products are manufactured and sold, such as the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Therefore, we have selected no.*

[Fixed row]

## (9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

### (9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

- No, but we plan to address this within the next two years

### (9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

- Important but not an immediate business priority

### (9.14.4) Please explain

*As a food company, General Mills will always depend on clean, abundant water to make our products. Livestock, plants, pollinators, healthy soil, and ecosystems in which farms are located all depend on water to grow our ingredients. As General Mills advances our work in regenerative agriculture, improved water efficiency and quality are some of the targeted outcomes. We are currently pursuing a "supply shed" approach to address water impact and other outcomes through regenerative agriculture, including some project such as our California almond pilot that aim to lower water impact. We may classify some of our products as low water impact in the future, as data from our pilots and other industry efforts is strengthened, and if certain brands advance supply chain projects related to improved water impact through regenerative agriculture.*

[Fixed row]

## (9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

- Yes

**(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.**

**Water pollution**

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

Yes

### Water withdrawals

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

Yes

### Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

Yes

### Other

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

No, but we plan to within the next two years

### (9.15.1.2) Please explain

*In FY22, we updated our water commitment to reflect the fact that as a food company, General Mills will always depend on clean, abundant water to grow our ingredients and manufacture our projects. "Regenerate water resources in our priority watersheds." In FY23, we began implementing the updated risk assessment on our tri-annual timeline to identify priority watersheds. Under this new strategy, we are in the process of setting 3-year action plans with context-based goals in each watershed. This may include site-specific goals, water intensity improvements for key ingredients and implementation of strategies such as regenerative agriculture in our upstream supplysheds. Some of these watershed-specific goals may include areas not listed, for example groundwater recharge, additional metrics related to regenerative agriculture or others relevant to the watershed's impairment and General Mills presence there. Therefore, we selected "No, but we plan to within the next two years."*

[Fixed row]

## (9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

### Row 1

#### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 1

#### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Country/area/region

#### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

Reduction in concentration of pollutants

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

03/01/2018

#### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

02/29/2020

#### (9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

### (9.15.2.7) End date of target year

05/31/2030

### (9.15.2.8) Target year figure

1000000

### (9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

600000

### (9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

### (9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

60

### (9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Planetary Boundaries

Sustainable Development Goal 6

Other, please specify :SDG 15

### (9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*In 2019, General Mills became the first large company to set a regenerative agriculture target: advance regenerative agriculture on 1 million acres of farmland by 2030. Advancing our regenerative agriculture commitment is a critical component of our water stewardship approach, as regenerative agriculture helps improve water quality by reducing pollution in waterways by reducing chemical application and soil runoff, which helps protect and restore clean water in nearby water bodies and groundwater. We regard this as an increase in habitat remediation and ecosystem protection. This target represents approximately 30% of General Mills' total estimated land print exposure (i.e. the land needed to grow volumes of the crops we buy or to feed animals for our ingredients). Direct sourcing is not excluded from*

this target but is not prioritized as the primary strategy. Prioritized supplysheds correspond to our high volume ingredients including wheat, oats, dairy, nuts, popcorn and cassava.

#### (9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

General Mills approach to advancing this target includes the following strategies: - Fund partnerships and advocate for public sector policies that catalyze systems change - Implement programs with partners and farmers focused on supply sheds - Experiment to design effective pathways for climate and nature resilience - Advance scientific understanding outcomes and adoption of regenerative agriculture, including of water quality improvement related to reduction of chemical application (e.g. synthetic nitrogen fertilizer) and improvement of in-field and edge-of-field habitat and ecosystem resilience - Support organic agriculture and related brand activities. For example, we partner with ALUS to support locally designed regenerative agriculture programming across three watersheds in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, our oat sourcing region, to compliment ALUS's on-farm habitat restoration program.

## Row 2

#### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 2

#### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Basin level

#### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

Reduction of water withdrawals from groundwater

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

08/05/2024

#### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2050

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

10

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

0

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

Planetary Boundaries

Other, please specify :SDG 15

**(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

Western Kansas is a critical sourcing region of wheat for General Mills Pillsbury brand. It sits atop the Ogallala Aquifer, the world's largest aquifer spanning eight states from Texas to South Dakota and covering a quarter of the irrigated land in the US and the majority of agriculture-dependent counties. The aquifer is critically over-drafted and must be returned to stable withdrawal/recharge levels (Q-stable), or parts of the aquifer may run dry within 50-100 years. General Mills is working to build the Ogallala Aquifer Coalition to achieve a regional shared goal of Q-stable in the Western Kansas portion of the aquifer. Currently the target focuses on Western Kansas, but our vision is to expand to the basin level as momentum for the work builds. The target number is a percentage reduction in total groundwater withdrawal (10% reduction).

### (9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

General Mills is working to build the Ogallala Aquifer Coalition to advance progress. In the reporting year, this work was being scoped to determine strategy and partners. Implementation activities will include advancing regenerative agriculture and diversifying crop rotations (e.g. including sorghum in a corn/soy rotation) to improve soil health/water holding capacity; restoring playas and grasslands to improve rainwater capture and aquifer recharge; and improving irrigation efficiency to reduce water withdrawals from the aquifer.

### Row 3

#### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 2

#### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Basin level

#### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

Reduction in total water withdrawals

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

10/23/2023

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

10/23/2023

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2030

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

1000000

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

175000

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

18

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

Planetary Boundaries

Water Resilience Coalition

### (9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

California is a critical sourcing region for General Mills, where we buy over 50 ingredients that are widely used throughout our products; almonds, processing tomatoes, and rice represent the biggest volumes. To reduce total water withdrawals and absolute consumption in California, General Mills joined the California Water Resilience Initiative (CWRI) in 2023. CWRI is a private-sector led initiative accelerating collective action across sectors to achieve a water-resilient future for California. CWRI has a shared target to reduce, reuse, and restore 1 million acre-feet of water per year by 2030.

### (9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

General Mills is contributing to the 1 million acre feet per year target by investing in water withdrawal reduction research and implementation in agriculture. For example, General Mills funds research with UC Davis on water balance in almond orchards to understand whether regenerative orchards can use less water than conventional orchards. Early results show growing almonds with regenerative agriculture principles improves soil health and increases water infiltration rates, which can potentially lead to reduction in irrigation and more water resilience to both drought and flood. General Mills also co-leads a working group on Regenerative Agriculture and Water (RAW Lab) to co-design multi-stakeholder NGO/corporate partnerships to measure water reductions/recharge and implement regenerative agriculture in almond, allium and tomato farming systems. CWRI anticipates that agriculture water strategies can contribute up to 1 third of the progress toward our shared goal.

## Row 4

### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 3

### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (including suppliers)

### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

Increase in the proportion of employees using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water

### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

08/04/2016

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

07/01/2016

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

05/31/2021

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

100

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

100

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Achieved and maintained

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6

Other, please specify :FDA Hazards Analysis & Critical Control Points

**(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*For food safety, all General Mills facilities and suppliers are required to provide WASH stations, which includes handwashing stations at the entrance to or within production areas and restrooms. Hand sanitizer is not considered to replace handwashing. All handwashing stations must include warm water, disinfecting soap, single use clean towels, a trash receptacle and adequate lighting. Facilities must provide a sufficient supply of potable water that meets local laws and regulations, WHO guidelines, and General Mills requirements. The policy for this was established in 2016 and is applicable to all owned operations globally with no exclusions. The target number is percentage of documented compliance. We started collecting data, therefore zero represents years prior to data collection. All internal plants are in compliance, and suppliers are subject to SMETA audits and undergo remediation when a non-compliance is discovered, therefore we have selected 100% achieved and maintained.*

*[Add row]*

### C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

#### Row 1

##### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Climate change

##### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 2)

Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 3)

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

ISO 14064-3

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*General Mills engages Apex Companies, LLC to annually verify our Scope 1, 2 and 3 activity and emissions data as well as our year-over-year changes in absolute emissions. Additional details on methodology and limited assurance opinion are included in the attached verification letter. Each year, we work to continually update our methodology, visibility and accuracy in accordance with current scientific and GHG accounting guidance.*

### (13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

*APEX YOY verification.pdf*

*[Add row]*

**(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.**

### (13.3.1) Job title

*Chief Procurement and Global Sustainability Officer*

### (13.3.2) Corresponding job category

*Select from:*

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

*[Fixed row]*

**(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.**

Select from:

No

