

Welcome to your CDP Climate Change Questionnaire 2021

C0. Introduction

C0.1

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

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

The Coca-Cola Company markets, manufactures and sells beverage concentrates and syrups and finished beverages. In our concentrate operations, The Coca-Cola Company typically generates net operating revenues (\$33 billion in 2020) by selling concentrates and syrups to authorized bottling partners. Our bottling partners combine the concentrates and syrups with still or sparkling water and sweeteners (depending on the product), to prepare, package, sell and distribute finished beverages. Our finished product operations consist primarily of company-owned or -controlled bottling, sales and distribution operations. The 43 countries listed under question C0.3 are the countries where The Coca-Cola Company owns and operates bottling plants.

In addition, we operate retail outlets through Costa Limited, which has nearly 4,000 coffeehouses in the United Kingdom, China and other markets across Europe, Asia Pacific, the Middle East and Africa. The company's portfolio also includes a coffee vending business, at-home coffee solutions and a roastery.

Consumers enjoy our finished beverage products, owned by or licensed to us, at a rate of 1.9 billion servings a day.

Our global business is able to operate on a local scale in every community where we do business because of the strength of the Coca-Cola system, which comprises our Company, approximately 225 bottling partners, 900 bottling plants, more than 700,000 employees and 30 million retail customer outlets worldwide. Beverage products bearing our trademarks, sold in the United States since 1886, are now sold in more than 200 countries and territories.

Innovating to become a total beverage company, in 2020, we announced plans to reorganize our company and establish a portfolio of drinks that would be best positioned to grow in a fast-changing marketplace. As part of this new, networked global organization, we transitioned from 400 master brands to approximately 200. Discontinuing some brands enables us to invest in growing trademarks like Minute Maid and Simply and to put more weight behind promising innovations like AHA flavored sparkling water, Topo Chico Hard Seltzer and Coca-Cola Energy.

We are curating a tailored collection of global, regional and local brands with the greatest potential to scale and grow. Our brands include sparkling soft drinks; water, enhanced water and sports drinks; juice, dairy and plant-based beverages; and tea and coffee.

Also in 2020, we announced strategic steps to transform our organizational structure to better enable us to capture growth in the fast, changing marketplace. We created nine operating units under our existing geographic segments, five global marketing category leadership teams and a new Platform Services organization to drive greater standardization and simplification, with technology and data at the forefront. Approximately 47% of positions changed in the organizational refresh process, excluding the Bottling Investments and Global Ventures operating segments.

In everything we do, we aim to be a more sustainable business. It's our responsibility to use our global scale for good. We're using our leadership to achieve positive change in the world and build a more sustainable future for our communities and our planet. We're doing this by taking action on our sustainable business priorities. These include providing consumers more beverage choices with less added sugar, rethinking our product packaging, replenishing water back to nature and communities and improving the efficiency of water use and treatment of waste water to high standards, and reducing our carbon footprint across our value chain while helping our business and communities adapt to the impacts of climate change.

In 2013, we committed to reducing the carbon footprint of “the drink in your hand” by 25%, compared to 2010 levels, by 2020. By the end of 2020 we had achieved a reduction of our carbon footprint by 25 percent. In 2020, 20-25% of carbon emissions were produced in our agriculture and ingredient supply chains, 25-30% in packaging, 10-15% in manufacturing, 5-10% in distribution and 30-35% in cooling and dispensing. In 2019, we raised our ambition and published a science-based target for the Coca-Cola system, which aims to reduce absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions 25% by 2030 from a 2015 base year. We support a vision to be net zero carbon by 2050, and our science-based target is a critical milestone that supports this longer-term ambition.

C0.2

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

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

C0.3

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

- Argentina
- Australia
- Bangladesh
- Botswana
- Brazil

Cambodia
Canada
Chile
China
Comoros
Costa Rica
Egypt
Eswatini
Ethiopia
France
Ghana
India
Indonesia
Ireland
Japan
Kenya
Malaysia
Mayotte
Mexico
Mozambique
Myanmar
Namibia
Nepal
Pakistan
Philippines
Puerto Rico
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Singapore
South Africa
Sri Lanka
Turkey
Uganda
United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America
Viet Nam
Zambia

C0.4

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

USD

C0.5

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

Operational control

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

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

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

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

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

Row 1

Primary reason

Do not own/manage land

Please explain

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

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

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

Agricultural commodity

Sugar

% of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

60-80%

Produced or sourced

Sourced

Please explain

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

We make our branded beverage products available to consumers globally through our network of Company-owned or controlled bottling and distribution operations, independent bottling partners, distributors, wholesalers and retailers. The Coca-Cola Company markets, manufactures and sells beverage concentrates, sometimes referred to as “beverage bases,” and syrups, including fountain syrups (we refer to this part of our business as our “concentrate business” or “concentrate operations”), as well as finished sparkling soft drinks and other non-alcoholic beverages (we refer to this part of our business as our “finished product business” or “finished product operations”).

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

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

C1. Governance

C1.1

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

Yes

C1.1a

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

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board-level committee	<p>The Environmental, Social, Governance and Public Policy Committee (ESGPPC) of the Company's Board of Directors bears the highest level of direct responsibility for climate-related issues within The Coca-Cola Company. The Committee assists the Board in overseeing the company's environmental, social, legislative, regulatory and public policy matters policies, including progress against the company's sustainability goals. The Committee's scope includes oversight and monitoring of the company's progress against our 'drink in your hand' target, which was to reduce the carbon footprint of the Coca-Cola system by 25% by the end of 2020, against a 2010 baseline, and the establishment of our Science-Based Target which is to reduce absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions 25% by 2030 from a 2015 base-year. The Committee is also responsible for overseeing and responding to climate-related risks including physical risks from changes to weather and precipitation patterns, extreme weather events and water scarcity which can disrupt/limit production and availability of ingredients and raw materials, and the risks of transition to a low-carbon economy including regulatory and reputational risks. The Committee reports regularly to the full Board on matters, including climate-related issues. The Committee has responsibility over climate issues because we believe that they have the potential to have a meaningful financial impact on the company and thus are a part of the Board's fiduciary duty. An example of a climate-related decision made by the committee, in 2020 they discussed the key ESG reporting frameworks, and endorsed CDP and TCFD as the key frameworks The Coca-Cola Company is following. Additionally, in 2020, Mel Lamagasino, lead independent director and member of the ESGPPC, along with our Company's Senior Vice President and Global Chief of Communications, Sustainability and Strategic Partnerships, briefed the Climate Action 100+ advocacy team that manages engagement with The Coca-Cola Company. Climate 100+ is an investor-led initiative, with over \$54 trillion in assets under management, to ensure the world's largest corporate greenhouse gas emitters take necessary action on climate change.</p>

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Please explain

a scheduled agenda item		
Scheduled – all meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Reviewing and guiding annual budgets Reviewing and guiding business plans Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues	<p>Climate-related issues receive direct oversight from the Board because we believe that they have the potential to have a meaningful financial impact on the company and thus are a part of the Board's fiduciary duty.</p> <p>The Board reviews and provides guidance on risks via a well-defined Enterprise Risk Management process, into which climate-related risks are incorporated. The Board set as a priority for the Company's CEO the implementation of the World Without Waste initiative, with a goal to collect the equivalent of 100% of the bottles and cans we sell by 2030. The initiative also intends to increase the amount of available recycled PET (rPET), which will significantly reduce carbon emissions in the packaging production process. The charter of the Environmental, Social, Governance and Public Policy Committee (ESGPPC) states that as part of its authorities and responsibilities, the Committee will review the nature and scope of the Company's sustainability goals and the Company's progress toward achieving those goals.</p> <p>To monitor performance against the Company's strategic goals and leadership objectives, the Board also actively engages in dialogue with our Company's senior leaders during each two-day board meeting.</p>

C1.2

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

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

C1.2a

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

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

In 2020, our CEO helped Ceres CEO and President, Mindy Lubber, unveil the Ceres Roadmap 2030, a 10-year action plan for sustainable business leadership to help stabilize the climate, protect water and natural resources, and build a just and inclusive economy. During the virtual session, our CEO discussed how the Company's sustainability priorities are integrated into our business operations, and he emphasized the connection between climate and packaging and the leadership role business needs play in influencing change. Also, at the World Economic Forum's Annual Meeting in January, our CEO and leaders of our sustainability teams met with leaders across government, the private sector and civil society, speaking on the role that corporations can play on critical issues ranging from packaging waste reduction to water scarcity. Following that, as meetings moved to a virtual format, the CEO participated in WEF and Friends of Ocean Actions' Virtual Oceans Dialogue panel, where he advised that private and public sectors must "redouble" efforts to tackle marine pollution and other critical

environmental challenges as the world focuses on the coronavirus pandemic and its economic impacts.

The Senior Vice President and Global Chief of Communications, Sustainability and Strategic Partnerships is the corporate executive team member responsible for climate-related issues and reports directly to the Chairman and CEO and Board of Directors. Responsibility for climate-related issues lies with this position at the executive team level because this role leads the company's sustainability strategy and has the authority, and influence to effectively act on climate-related issues. The Senior Vice President and Global Chief of Communications, Sustainability and Strategic Partnerships works directly with the Vice President (VP) for Global Public Policy, Environmental Sustainability, and Social Impact to set our global sustainability strategy and goals, including our science-based greenhouse gas emissions target and climate strategy and to track performance against those goals. The SVP also works with the VP to ensure coordination across Operating Units, the sharing of best practices, and an open channel for informing and communicating with the Chairman & CEO and Board of Directors on climate-related risks and opportunities at the global level. The SVP also presents to the Environmental, Social, Governance and Public Policy Committee at least once a year, related to the accomplishment of the Company's sustainability goals, including our climate target.

C1.3

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

	Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues	Comment
Row 1	Yes	An annual compensation package tied to year over year sustainability achievements, including those related to climate, has existed for the past few years. However, the Board of Directors understands the need to better reflect the long-term focus that is also required to support multi-year sustainability goals and ambitions in executive long-term incentive compensation. Therefore, at their direction, we are working toward enhancements in the connections of sustainability metrics to annual as well as long-term executive compensation.

C1.3a

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

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Corporate executive team	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target	Recognition of Individual Performance: We recognize that non-financial goals, including environmental and social goals, are critical to our business, reflect our external

			<p>responsibility as global leaders, and add value for our shareowners and other stakeholders. Therefore, annual incentive compensation plans are designed to reward executives for annual performance on key operational and financial measures, as well as individual performance and significant non-financial achievements.</p> <p>Our annual compensation package, tied to year over year sustainability achievements, has existed for the past few years. However, the Board of Directors understands the need to better reflect the long-term focus that is also required to support multi-year sustainability goals and ambitions in executive long-term incentive compensation. Therefore, at their direction, we are working toward enhancements in the connections of sustainability metrics to annual as well as long-term executive compensation.</p> <p>The annual incentive of our Chairman and CEO; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer; Chief Marketing Officer and President, Asia Pacific Group; Senior Vice President and General Counsel; President and Chief Operating Officer; Senior Vice President and Global Chief of Communications, Sustainability and Strategic Partnerships; and Chief Technical Officer is linked to their individual performance toward achieving non-financial goals such as our emissions reduction target.</p>
--	--	--	--

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

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

Yes

C2.1a

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

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	2	
Medium-term	2	4	

Long-term	5		Long-term strategic considerations are on a 5+ year time horizon
-----------	---	--	--

C2.1b

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

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

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

Each risk item is given a likelihood score and a consequence score, on a 5-point scale, 1 being the lowest, and 5 being the highest. Based on the combination of likelihood score and consequence score, each potential risk event is ranked and management actions are considered.

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

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

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

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

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

C2.2

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

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term
Long-term

Description of process

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

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

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

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

Each risk item is given a likelihood score and a consequence score, on a 5-point scale, 1 being the lowest, and 5 being the highest. Based on the combination of likelihood score and consequence score, management actions are considered. On the likelihood scale, two factors are considered when determining the score: estimated time horizon and probability of risk event. The risk event is given a score of 1 to 5: (1 - Rare, 2 - Unlikely, 3 - Possible, 4 - Likely, 5 - Almost Certain). On the consequence scale, each risk event is considered against 7 factors to arrive at the score: Financial, Strategy and Business Planning, Reputation, Political and Regulatory, Health, Safety and Environment, Operational objectives, and People. The risk event is then given a score of 1 to 5: (1 - Insignificant, 2 - Minor, 3 - Moderate, 4 - Major, 5 - Critical).

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

Case study for Physical Risk: The Risk Steering Committee discussed the results of our global water risk assessment which was updated in 2020 to map all bottling facility locations against the water stress level of the watersheds where they withdraw water, using the WRI's Aqueduct 3.0 tool. Currently, 39% of our total global system-wide production volume is generated in areas of high or extremely high-water stress. Of the company-owned facilities, 21% of total water withdrawn was made in areas of high or extremely high water stress. The committee discussed the identified risk of water scarcity disrupting and limiting production, amongst other water-related risks, with the impacts of climate change as well as the growing demand for water being a major driver of this risk. The response was support for further management of this risk and other

water-related risks within our 2030 water security strategy which includes the 2030 global goals in our operations to 1) Achieve 100% regenerative water use in leadership locations (defined as bottling plants located in areas of water stress, high water risk or projected water stress); 2) Drive advanced water efficiency improvements in water-stressed contexts; and 3) Align global facilities with Alliance for Water Stewardship principles and comply with Coca-Cola water stewardship requirements (prevent, reduce, safely discharge). To support these goals, specific context-based targets will be set by the Operating Units and our bottling partners.

Case study for Transition Risk: Emerging regulation risk is assessed under the theme of Political and Regulatory within the Company's annual enterprise risk assessment. One emerging regulation risk is increased regulation and prices on GHG emissions. As more GHG emissions regulations emerge and prices increase on existing schemes, there could be increasing impact on our business. Medium-to-long term risk of GHG pricing emerged as one of our top 8 climate-related risks both from the standpoint of our own direct emissions at our system's facilities and the cost of potential pricing to our suppliers and customers. The Coca-Cola system operates in 46 national and 32 subnational jurisdictions that impose a price on 22% of the world's GHG emissions. External consultant analysis estimated combined direct and indirect costs to the Coca-Cola system was \$132.5 million in 2020. The external consultant assessment of the risk is an impact of \$2.1 billion- \$4.8 billion on the system if at a minimum the average of existing carbon prices were levied globally and at a maximum a carbon price was levied globally that would keep the world to a 1.5 degree °C warming. The Company's Global Policy & Sustainability team and local public affairs teams around the world continue to monitor existing and emerging carbon pricing schemes at regional and national levels. If these schemes do not impact our facilities directly, they could impact our fuel and energy prices or the costs of production of raw materials, impacting our business indirectly. The Company's agreed response to the risk is to continue to reduce our GHG emissions and pursue our science-based goal to reduce our absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions by 25% by 2030. We also support a vision to be net zero carbon by 2050.

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

Risk management process

A specific climate-related risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term
Medium-term

Long-term

Description of process

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

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

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

The identified priority climate-related risks were:

- (1) Changes to weather and precipitation patterns limiting the availability of ingredients and raw materials: The second highest potential exposure is from this risk, which has potential to impact a broad set of products and markets, with the potential to impact long-term growth strategies. For example, a total of USD 1.6-4.6 billion of revenue is currently dependent on corn from the United States that is grown in regions considered to have high-extremely high baseline water stress.
- (2) Extreme weather events disrupting production and limiting distribution: One-off extreme events pose significant potential impact resulting from significant off line periods or cost of activating alternative supply routes. These risks often have high visibility and carry reputational risk as well. For example, in 2017-2018, we estimate that Hurricane Maria caused losses of approximately USD 72 million to the business.
- (3) Water scarcity disrupting sourcing and/or production: The highest potential exposure is from this risk. Water is a critical ingredient to our products and essential in the production of many of our ingredients. Additionally, the communities where we operate require adequate supplies of water. Disruption in the supply of available freshwater would create challenges across our value chains. We estimate that USD 946 million of revenue is dependent upon bottling facilities in India that operate in areas considered to have high baseline water stress.
- (4) GHG and/or water regulations increasing COGS (GHG) or disrupting production: At

the moment, analyses indicate lower exposure on transition risks than on physical risks. Nonetheless, we estimate a USD 700 million potential exposure by 2030, based on calculations using the REMIND 2-degree scenario.

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

Case study for Physical Risk:

Our experience, including in 2017-2018 when Hurricane Maria caused an estimated USD 72 million in damages to our bottling facility and concentrate production facility in Puerto Rico, combined with the results of these climate-related risk assessments as well as bottoms-up risk assessment performed by all manufacturing facilities at least twice per year and top-down risk and opportunity assessment performed by geographical operating unit leadership, led to the prioritization of extreme weather events disrupting production and limiting distribution as a significant risk factor. The system's response in Puerto Rico has built on years of investment in vertically integrating its supply chain, including the self-manufacturing of key packaging items to minimize dependence on the U.S. mainland for supplies, and the ability to produce CO₂ and some packaging items on site, as well as the capacity to store large amounts of key ingredients on site. More recent response strategies include updates to Business Continuity Planning (BCP) with additional transportation routes and carriers, the build-up of inventory during hurricane season at facilities, and activation of our Incident Management & Crisis Resolution (IMCR) program.

Case study for Transition Risk:

As a transition risk case study, the results of the climate-related risk assessment helped identify carbon pricing and climate-related regulation as risk to the company and to assess the potential impact on the business. This was estimated to be USD 700 million potential exposure by 2030, based on calculations using the REMIND 2-degree scenario. One example of carbon pricing risk is in California where carbon tax in 2020 had a net impact of USD 8.5 million on our bottling partner. This risk assessment provided a critical input into the decision to set and pursue a science-based goal to reduce our absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions by 25% by 2030. We also support a vision to be net zero carbon by 2050.

C2.2a

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

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

		<p>existing schemes, there could be increasing impact on our business. Medium-to-long term risk of GHG pricing emerged as one of our top 8 climate-related risks both from the standpoint of our own direct emissions at our system’s facilities and the cost of potential pricing to our suppliers and customers. The Coca-Cola System operates in 46 national and 32 subnational jurisdictions that impose a price on 22% of the world’s GHG emissions. An external consultant's analysis estimated combined direct and indirect costs to the Coca-Cola system was \$132.5 million in 2020. The external consultant's assessment of the risk is an impact of \$2.1 billion- \$4.8 billion on the System if at a minimum the average of existing carbon prices were levied globally and at a maximum a carbon price was levied globally that would keep the world to a 1.5 degree C warming.</p>
Technology	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Technology risk is assessed under the themes of Strategic and Reputational, Operational, and Macro / Economic, and includes such risks as increased requirements for investment in our supply base of equipment vendors, and ongoing associated costs to our system.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments, led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of Technology risk is: Costs to transition to lower emissions technology. In the US, ongoing reductions to the maximum daily energy consumption quota of our refrigeration equipment are applied every 3-4 years, driving requirements for investment in our supply base, and ongoing associated costs to our system. Refrigeration equipment, such as vending machines, coolers and fountain equipment form a significant part of our emissions, as well as being a critical component of our product distribution infrastructure. In the United States, our refrigeration equipment is subject to both voluntary and mandatory energy consumption standards. The Environmental Protection Agency's Energy STAR program provides ratings for energy-efficient refrigeration equipment, against which many of our customers require compliance. In addition, the Department of Energy's Conservation Standards for Beverage Vending Machines and Refrigeration Equipment reduces the</p>

		<p>maximum daily energy consumption quota of this equipment every 3-4 years, driving requirements for investment in our supply base, and ongoing associated costs to our system.</p>
Legal	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Legal risk is assessed under the themes of Strategic and Reputational, and Political and Regulatory.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments, led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of legal risk is: Compliance with legal regulations. This risk is assessed against not only GHG emissions-related issues, but other relevant areas that may have direct or indirect links to climate change, such as packaging or water regulation. Compliance to legal requirements is non-negotiable and therefore the expectation is for any areas where a legal breach may result, we must capture in our local, or global risk assessments.</p> <p>An example of a change in law is in the European Union, where in 2019, the European Green New Deal was announced, and with that, the European Commission published its circular economy action plan. In parallel, member states such as France have adopted specific regulations, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of single-use plastic bottles put on the market should be reduced by 50% by 2030 - The end of single-use plastic packaging by 2040 - An amendment providing that France should adopt a national trajectory to increase the share of reused packaging by 5% of on all beverage packaging placed on the market in 2023 and by 10% in 2027 was also adopted. <p>These measures would all impact The Coca-Cola Company's products.</p>
Market	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People,</p>

		<p>Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Market risk is assessed under the themes Strategic and Reputational, and Macro / Economic.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments, led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>Examples of market risk are: Increased cost of raw materials and Uncertainty in market signals. Our assessment of market risk did not emerge as a major risk area for our business. However, there is potential that climate change impacts may increase the cost of certain raw materials through various regulations and uncertainties, or through damage or losses in efficiency due to climate change impacts.</p> <p>Variations in supply and demand at global or regional levels could impact the price and availability of raw materials and materials needed for our products. In particular, a potential increase in the prices, or limitation in the availability of key raw materials could increase our cost base, which may or may not be passed onto customers and consumers. In 2020, as a result of the COVID-19 crisis, global oil prices plummeted drastically, creating an imbalance in the market for recycled PET plastic in our packaging. Our business remains committed to our goal of using 50% recycled material in our primary consumer packaging by 2030, and our teams have made significant adjustments to our tactics and strategy in order to remain on track. The nature of this market shift, as a sudden and unexpected event, is analogous to how our experts indicate climate change impacts may affect the market. In addition, as a business, we will remain committed to our climate-related goals even as we experience shifts in the market.</p>
Reputation	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Reputation risk is assessed under the theme Strategic and Reputational, and People.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments, led by our</p>

		<p>sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>Examples of reputational risks are: Shifts in consumer preferences in response to how company is handling climate risk and Stigmatization of sector. Reputational risk emerged as a potential long-term risk for the company. There is reputational risk due to consumers possibly associating the company and sector with water stress, fossil fuel use (through plastics or in production) and other climate-related challenges. This possible association may impact sales as purchase decisions could be impacted by this association. Our internal research suggests that our consumers are becoming increasingly interested in the environmental and social aspects of our beverages. They want to know not only what's in their beverages, but how they were produced, where the ingredients originated and how they were grown (social and environmental practices). In a recent survey, "environmentally sound manufacturing" was identified as a top 3 issue for consumers, after product safety and job creation, with 28% of respondents agreeing that it is a salient sustainability issue. Furthermore, "environmentally sound manufacturing" was associated overwhelmingly with the amount of GHG emissions in manufacturing. Additionally, the recent climate protests have succeeded in putting climate change and the engagement of corporations in this debate in the forefront of public awareness.</p>
<p>Acute physical</p>	<p>Relevant, always included</p>	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Acute physical risk is assessed under the themes People and Operational.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments, led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of acute physical risk is: Extreme weather events including storms, hurricanes, floods & extreme drought. The most significant potential impact to the system from one-off extreme events is disruption to manufacture and distribution. Damage to key concentrate production or bottling plants could result in off-line periods and reduced supply. One-off events can impact crop availability in certain areas, and disrupt</p>

		<p>consumers in the specific area of the event. However, as a global company buying ingredients and raw materials in bulk from various regions, and selling across the world, these one-off events are generally considered less material.</p> <p>These risks often have high visibility and carry reputational risk as well. For example, in 2017-2018, Hurricane Maria caused significant damage to our bottling facility and concentrate production facility in Puerto Rico. Through ongoing planning informed by the BCP process, the local Company and bottling partner facilities were able to restart production in less than three weeks following the disaster and provide aid to the communities where they operate. As part of the Company's commitment to support our people and our communities during this difficult time, repairing the water treatment system constituted a priority, and once operational, we provided water to employees and to the city of Cidra as well. The city collected approximately 20,000 gallons (70,000 liters) of potable water a day from our facility. As a result, of these activities, the overall loss to the system of Hurricane Maria is estimated at approximately USD 72 million.</p>
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	<p>At an enterprise level, The Coca-Cola Company conducts an annual enterprise risk assessment, based on our internal risk taxonomy, which includes 5 broad thematic areas: Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic. These further divide into 22 risk categories. The impacts of climate change are integrated into this assessment at the risk category level, capturing the potential impacts climate change could have on our business. Chronic physical risk is assessed under the themes Strategic and Reputational, People, Operational, Political and Regulatory, and Macro / Economic.</p> <p>On our regular, specific climate-related risk assessments, led by our sustainability function, risks are assessed alongside all of the categories recommended by the TCFD: Policy and Legal, Technology, Market, Reputation, Acute Physical, and Chronic Physical.</p> <p>An example of chronic physical risk is: Water scarcity (including changes in precipitation patterns). As climate change impacts affect levels of water stress and water scarcity, changes to water availability for key facilities can have implications for production capacity. Water scarcity can also have implications for quality and availability of key ingredients and packaging raw materials, which has potential to impact a broad set of products and markets, with the added potential to impact long-term growth strategies. For example, we estimate that currently USD 1.6-4.6 billion of revenue is from products that depend on corn from the United States that is grown in regions considered to have high - extremely high baseline water stress, and any significant variability in</p>

		the availability of corn could impact products and strategies in this market .
--	--	--

C2.3

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

Yes

C2.3a

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

Identifier

Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical
Rising mean temperatures

Primary potential financial impact

Increased direct costs

Company-specific description

The Coca-Cola Company conducted a climate-related risk assessment to evaluate the projected climate change exposure of orange crops across 14 Coca-Cola orange crop growing countries. This study focused on the near term 2020-2039 climate exposure and general sensitivity as a first step toward assessing climate vulnerability and thereafter risk. Through this risk assessment, we identified countries and sourcing regions with higher future exposures to climate parameters that could damage the orange crop or prohibit the growth of a healthy, resilient and consistent orange supply. The orange crop was chosen due to its importance as a major ingredient to our products, especially juices. Given the crop profile of oranges, the key climate parameters that have the biggest potential to damage or destroy crop production include extreme temperatures. The optimum temperature for citrus growth and fruiting and for the crop to grow and maximize yield and quality is in the range of 12.8°C to 37°C . Temperatures above or below this range could have adverse effects on oranges.

This risk assessment revealed that orange crops will be most exposed to increases in the number of hot days (Tmax >35°C) and in the number of tropical nights (Tmin >20°C), especially for the following Coca-Cola orange crop growing regions: Costa Rica, Brazil and Argentina. Among all of Coca-Cola's orange juice supply regions, Costa

Rica's orange growing areas will have the highest exposure for three of the four climate parameters, namely increases in hot days (maximum temperature [Tmax] >35°C degrees Celsius), tropical nights (minimum temperature [Tmin] >20°C) and in heat wave probability.

Based on the findings above, we consider the climate change impacts on the sourcing of orange from the most exposed countries to be a critical risk to monitor and understand. Orange juice and orange by-products account for 21-40% of our revenue and are a primary ingredient for several of our products, for example, Simply Orange and Minute Maid Original, so a reduction in yields in key sourcing countries to temperature extremes may increase prices.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

77,119,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

192,797,500

Explanation of financial impact figure

The Company's procurement team estimate, based on experiences to date, is that there could be a potential price increase of between 20 to 50% as a result of decreasing orange yields caused by increasing extreme temperatures in countries at risk of being most affected - Costa Rica, Brazil and Argentina. The minimum financial impact figure reflects a 20% price increase to our current procurement spend on orange juice and orange by-products for these three countries: $\text{USD } 385,595,000 \times 0.20 = \text{USD } 77,119,000$. The maximum financial impact figure reflects a 50% price increase to our current procurement spend on orange juice and orange by-products for these three countries: $\text{USD } 385,595,000 \times 0.50 = \text{USD } 192,797,500$.

Cost of response to risk

40,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

In 2020, 44% of orange ingredient volumes were sustainably sourced, meaning our suppliers demonstrated that the farms growing our ingredients meet one of a suite of leading global sustainability standards that are aligned with our 15 Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP). In 2020, we updated our SAGP to our new Principles for Sustainable Agriculture (PSA), which form the basis for our continued engagement with suppliers and industry platforms to achieve compliance, transparency and continuous improvement of the farm base against these principles. Importantly, the PSA will help the company to manage risks from extreme temperatures on our orange supply chain as they include a focus on climate change resilience, and they specify that farms must assess climate-related risks and have climate adaptation and resilience plans in place to appropriately address current and anticipated impacts of climate change while avoiding additional harm to nature or people. In 2020, we introduced a supplier self-assessment questionnaire that was distributed to our ~200 juice suppliers for our top 5 fruits, including orange. The questionnaire allows the company to assess supplier's level of compliance with our SAGPs. Following the completion of the questionnaire we review and validate supplier responses during on-site audits. In addition, in 2020 we began implementing a new data assurance process using a Supplier Letter of Attestation. This letter is completed by suppliers and provides details of the percentage of volume of agriculture ingredients supplied to the Company that comply with SAGPs and details of relevant certification that are met.

The cost of response to the Company to this risk is USD 40,000 and is the annual contribution from the Company to The Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAI Platform). The SAI Platform is a global not-for-profit organization supporting the food and drink industry to more sustainably source and produce. It enables members to share expertise, create solutions to common challenges and promote sustainable agriculture in a pre-competitive environment. The SAI Platform supports orange producers in key South American growing regions (amongst other commodities and locations) where we source orange juice and orange by-products to comply and to be verified as in compliance with our PSA (formerly SAGP). In addition, our suppliers are making their own investments to build a more sustainable orange supply chain.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical

Other, please specify

Water scarcity and availability

Primary potential financial impact

Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

Company-specific description

Water is a critical ingredient in more than 99% of our products. It's essential to the production of many of our ingredients, particularly our key agricultural ingredients, 12 of which are in our sustainable agriculture program. And, the communities where we operate require adequate supplies of water. Disruption in the supply of available fresh water would therefore create challenges across our value chains.

In 2020, The Coca-Cola Company conducted a global water risk assessment using the World Resources Institute's Aqeduct 3.0 tool. This assessment provided a holistic, global view of our exposure to systemic water-related hazards, including baseline water stress, projected water stress to 2030, water quality challenges and access to water and sanitation (WASH) challenges, for direct operations and key agricultural commodities. Among several potential exposures identified, "water scarcity disrupting sourcing and/or production" was found to be the highest potential exposure. We estimate that 39% of our global system-wide production volume was generated in high water-stressed regions. Of the company-owned facilities, 21% of total water withdrawn was made in areas of high or extremely high water stress. Water scarcity also threatens our agricultural supply chain, with key sourcing regions in North America and Asia experiencing increasing water stress.

Based on this assessment, India is the geography with the largest number of facilities owned by The Coca-Cola Company exposed to potential baseline water stress risk. 10 facilities in India were identified to be located in areas of high or extremely high baseline water stress, spread across Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Rajasthan, Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. This response focuses on this market as it is one of our most substantive market risks. Findings of our risk assessment indicate that approximately \$946 million of annual revenue is dependent upon bottling facilities in India that operate in areas considered to have high baseline water stress. For this reason, building climate resilience into our water strategy—including replenishing, improvements in efficiency of usage and source water assessments—is critical to addressing water stress as a business risk.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

946,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

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

Assumptions below:

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

Cost of response to risk

41,500,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

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

In India, 10 of our Company-owned bottling facilities lie in areas that are considered to be under extremely high or high water stress, according to the WRI's aqueduct tool. As such, we invest in activities to manage and mitigate these risks, which focus on increasing water availability and increasing water efficiency.

As a case study, in Uttar Pradesh, local NGOs and our bottling partner installed the first rainwater harvesting project nearly 15 years ago. Since then, the partnership has commissioned 39 rainwater harvesting structures to recharge ground water and we continue to improve water efficiency in our plants including introducing water reuse technology. Additionally, between 2019 and 2020 we installed a new rainwater harvesting system at our facility in Kursi, Uttar Pradesh with the potential to save 48,000

liters of water per year. The Company has invested over \$41.5 million in the last 10 years in water-related projects in and around our facilities in India in locations under Extremely High or High water stress. These projects include the construction of check dams, installation of surface water tanks and reverse osmosis systems, in addition to rain water harvesting systems.

The cost of response is USD 41,500,000 which is specifically our CAPEX + OPEX for water-related projects in India that were implemented both within our manufacturing plants and in local communities in the last 10 years in locations under Extremely High or High water stress. These projects include the construction of check dams, installation of surface water tanks and reverse osmosis systems, in addition to rain water harvesting systems.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation
Carbon pricing mechanisms

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

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

One of the identified top priority climate-related risks was: "GHG regulations increasing COGS or disrupting production." The Coca-Cola system operates in 46 national and 32 subnational jurisdictions regulated by some type of carbon pricing or carbon trading scheme. For example, the California carbon tax introduced in 2020 impacts our bottling facilities in the country, with a net impact of USD 8.5 million in 2020. Additionally, various regional or national schemes such as the EU ETS and other fuel taxes have an impact on some of our suppliers and bottling partners. We conducted a detailed analysis

of the potential impacts of a carbon pricing to our business, using the REMIND 2-degree scenario and the IEA's World Energy Outlook "New Policies" as a business-as-usual scenario.

There are currently only a handful of GHG emissions pricing policies or schemes in which the food and beverage sector is directly covered. As it relates to our Scope 2 and 3 emissions, many of the key commodities we source are, or will be, covered in carbon pricing policies. Therefore, our analyses indicate low exposure today, though in the long-term we expect that the impact to the business could become significant if no emissions reductions activities were taken.

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

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

2,100,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

4,800,000,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

The current impact of carbon pricing policies on the Coca-Cola system is not yet materially significant but is expected to grow with the increase of carbon prices and expected expansion of policies to more jurisdictions. Today, existing carbon pricing policies cost the Coca-Cola system approximately 0.3 cents (USD) per package sold, on average, in the select markets where a carbon price is in place. An external consultant's analysis estimated combined direct and indirect costs to the Coca-Cola system was \$132.5 million in 2020. As a minimum potential financial impact figure, if an average of existing carbon prices were levied globally, then our costs would increase to 1.3 cents

(USD) per package sold, or a total cost of \$2.1 billion in 2030. That is 1.3 cents per package x 1.6 billion packages= \$2.1 billion. As a maximum potential financial impact figure, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that to meet the goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, the 2030 carbon price would need to increase to at least \$90-\$220/tCO₂. This scenario would increase our cost to 3 cents (USD) per package sold, totaling nearly \$4.8 billion in 2030. That is 3 cents per package x 1.6 billion packages= \$4.8 billion.

Cost of response to risk

305,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

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

As a case study, the Coca-Cola system operates in 46 national and 32 subnational jurisdictions regulated by some type of carbon pricing or carbon trading scheme. One of these jurisdictions is California which enacted an emission trading scheme (ETS) 15 years ago to help reduce its carbon emissions. The Coca-Cola system, principally through its bottler, the Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling Company, operates throughout the state of California. Our current impact (Scopes 1 and 2) of the California ETS is limited but primarily comes from fuel usage at our bottling facilities, which are primarily used as inputs to thermal heating and on-site electrical generation equipment. The Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling Company has undertaken unique initiatives such as investments in alternative and clean energy fuels and uses hybrid vehicles, hydrogen fuel cells and electric trucks. Fifteen Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling facilities upgraded to LED lighting, which will save more than 2.4 million kilowatts annually. These investments mitigate the system's overall carbon footprint in the state and help to reduce the cost impacts of the California ETS.

Currently, 10-15% of our overall global emissions come from our manufacturing. One of the key ways we will reduce these emissions to target levels is by increasing our use of renewable energy. We estimate that the total investments required will be approximately USD 165 million of capital outlay and USD 70-140 million incremental annual operating costs across our system (including bottlers) assuming that this would be achieved with a mix of installed generation and purchase agreements. The cost of response to this risk is represented as a sum of the CAPEX and OPEX costs, 165 + 140 = 305 million.

Comment

C2.4

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

Yes

C2.4a

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

Identifier

Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Downstream

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of recycling

Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description

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

Specifically, packaging accounts for roughly one third of the carbon footprint across our value chain. Of this one third, our calculations show that roughly half can be attributed to aluminum cans and just under a quarter each can be attributed to plastic and glass. While the exact figure is dependent on the packaging material as well as the technology

and infrastructure in use, recycling saves a significant amount of energy and emissions in comparison with virgin materials. In addition, in specific markets, we are finding that consumers indicate a preference toward products that are recyclable and use recycled material in their packaging design. In many markets, refillable packaging appears to show a similar trend. There is a potential opportunity for increased consumer relevance and, as a consequence, increased revenues resulting from designing recyclable packaging that uses recycled material, engaging on packaging collection and recycling, as well as offering refillable packaging options in appropriate markets.

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

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

300,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

Approximately 90% of our volume is currently being served in recyclable packaging. We estimate that 60% of that amount is currently being collected for recycling and/or refill. Additionally, in 2020 we used 22% recycled material in our packaging globally, across all of our consumer-facing primary packaging.

By working to collect and recycle the outstanding amount, use more recycled material and provide packaging options preferable to consumers, we believe this unlocks opportunities for further growth of our business. The amount above indicates the approximate potential financial impact, for every 1% of revenue growth, based on 2020 operating revenue. This does not mean that we expect this amount of growth. This number is simply a benchmark for further calculations and estimates.

Cost to realize opportunity

19,500,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Our strategy to realize this opportunity is our World Without Waste (WWW) program, announced in 2018, with global goals that apply across our Company and bottling partners: (1) Make 100% of our packaging recyclable globally by 2025—and use at least 50% recycled material in our packaging by 2030; (2) Collect and recycle a bottle or can for each one we sell by 2030; and (3) Work together to support a healthy, debris-free environment. In 2020 we invested more than \$19.5 million globally to improve packaging collection rates and recycling infrastructure. This includes the launch of a bottle-to-bottle Coca-Cola Philippines Recycling Facility and support to more than 16,000 waste pickers in Brazil. We contribute to industry programs to achieve our WWW goals. New industry pledges totaled over \$200 million in 2020. The cost to realize opportunity does not include the cost we pay as premium for recycled PET, which is on the same order of magnitude. In addition, the Coca-Cola North America (CCNA) developed packaging, recycling and sustainability training for customer teams so they can lead sustainability and WWW customer conversations. Training rolled out to over 500 Coca-Cola North America employees, including large franchise bottlers, with plans to promote and scale the training. Also in 2020, we set a goal to reduce our use of virgin plastic derived from non-renewable sources by a cumulative 3 million metric tons over the next 5 years.

Case Study: Today, 24% of Coca-Cola’s sales volume in Uruguay is in returnable packages, meaning there is tremendous opportunity to increase the share of returnable packages, which will help meet the growing demand among consumers for more sustainable packaging options while reducing costs and lowering emissions. As part of the system’s commitment to increase returnable packaging use, Coca-Cola FEMSA Uruguay invested \$12.7 million to update production lines and introduce the ‘Universal Bottle’ both for glass and PET. The ‘Universal Bottle’ glass bottle can be refilled 25 times and the PET bottle 15 times. It can also be filled with the same or another beverage and re-marked with a new label. The ‘Universal Bottle’ reduces washing, filling and costs in terms of reverse logistics while lowering carbon emissions. At the end of their useful life, the bottles are recycled along with their recyclable paper labels. Through this project, the local team aims to increase the share of refillables by 5% per year to 2025, starting in 2020.

Comment

Identifier

Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Energy source

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

The Coca-Cola Company's syrup and juice production plants, bottling plants and distribution facilities, as well as our independent bottling partners' bottling plants and distribution facilities use a significant amount of electricity, natural gas and other energy sources for operation. The Coca-Cola system operates in 46 national and 32 subnational jurisdictions regulated by some type of carbon pricing or carbon trading scheme. As a result, we see an opportunity for potential savings based on our possible exposure to GHG emissions pricing in the future. One of our key interventions to pursue this opportunity is to invest in renewable energy.

For example, Coca-Cola Amatil committed to move to 100% renewable electricity across its entire operations by 2030, and Coca-Cola HBC has committed that 50% of total energy used in its plants will be from renewable and clean sources, and 100% of the total electricity used in its plants in EU and Switzerland will be from renewable and clean sources by 2025. Coca-Cola Swire also aims to generate 100% of the electricity it uses in its operations from renewable sources by 2026. Coca-Cola European Partners already achieved its target of purchasing 100% renewable electricity in 2018.

As an example of our partners' work, Coca-Cola European Partners built a solar farm that supplies around 15% of electricity demand to the Wakefield factory in Northern England, the largest soft drinks production facility in Europe. As another example, Coca-Cola Beverages Sri Lanka Ltd. (CCBSL) boasts one of the country's largest single-location solar rooftops. The Biyagama project was completed in 2019 and recently inaugurated as part of our company's pledge to source renewable energy and reduce our carbon footprint. The installation includes more than 5,000 solar panels over approximately 80% of the bottling facility's roof. Together, these panels will generate an estimated 2,730 megawatt hours a year of renewable energy to the national grid.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

35,211,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

145,112,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

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

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

Cost to realize opportunity

305,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

One of our key interventions to achieve our science-based emissions target and avoid future impacts of carbon pricing is to invest in renewable energy, with many Operating Units having made investments and/or implemented renewable energy goals with significant progress realized. We created a Renewable Energy Guide to help local teams make informed decisions on potential investments, and we have been working locally in several markets to embrace renewable energy initiatives.

As a case study, our bottling partner Coca-Cola European Partners (CCEP) is realizing the opportunity to reduce Scope 2 emissions through a strategy of purchasing electricity from renewable sources and generating electricity from renewable sources onsite. For example, CCEP's site in Chaudfontaine, Belgium uses solar panels, geothermal heat capture and a new hydro-electric turbine to produce more than 15% of the factory's energy needs. In 2020, 100% of CCEP's purchased electricity came from renewable sources, allowing the System to avoid 140,000 tons of CO₂e in 2020. Using renewable energy could help the System in Europe to reduce operating costs as a result of potential carbon pricing schemes or taxes on carbon, if it were to be introduced in the future. A price/tax on carbon of between €40-€50 per tonCO₂e (based on the average EU ETS carbon price during 2020) for Europe would represent a reduction in costs of €5.6m – €7m (\$6.6m - \$8.2m) in comparison to a scenario where CCEP did not use renewable energy.

Through these efforts, we have significantly reduced our Scope 2 emissions under a market-based approach, and as a System have increased our use of renewable energy

from 15% in 2019 to 17% in 2020, helping us to potentially reduce operational costs in future as a result of carbon price schemes should they be introduced in the future.

Cost to realize opportunity across the System: Around 10-15% of our emissions come from manufacturing and production. Based on incremental renewable energy use required across our bottling system to reduce this amount to target levels, we estimate the total cost of implementing this intervention would be approximately USD 165 million of capital outlay and USD 70-140 million incremental annual operating cost, across the System, assuming that this would be achieved with a mix of installed generation and power purchase agreements. The cost of response to this risk is represented as a sum of the CAPEX and OPEX costs, $165 + 140 = 305$ million.

Comment

Identifier

Opp3

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Downstream

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact

Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description

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

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

With many of our retail customers under increasing cost pressure and greater scrutiny for their sustainability and environmental performance, the ability to deliver more energy-efficient, environmentally friendly coolers is a key focus of strategic importance for The Coca-Cola Company and many of our bottling partners. In 2020, we planned for the 2021 launch of a global cold drink equipment project with a technology partner that will help us improve real-time tracking of the energy efficiency and placing of our equipment, which will help us better understand the entire sustainability impact and accelerate impact for the future.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

300,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

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

With each 1% of revenue growth that this opportunity could drive, the financial impact is listed above, based on our 2020 net operating revenue.

Cost to realize opportunity

100,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

A major focus for improvement has been phasing out hydrofluorocarbon (HFCs) refrigerants, using natural refrigerant fluids, in our cold-drink equipment across our global value chain. In 2020, The Coca-Cola Company and its bottlers introduced 571,753 units of HFC-free refrigeration equipment, adding up to a total of more than 5

million HFC-free coolers and vending machines that we have introduced into the marketplace since the program began.

In addition, we have more than 5.6 million intelligent energy management devices in use on our refrigeration equipment, reducing customer electricity consumption and saving them an estimated \$400 million annually and delivering corresponding emissions reductions of approximately 3.1 million metric tons per year.

Since 2010, the aggregate sum of project budgets invested to develop more sustainable and energy efficient coolers exceeded USD 100,000,000. We have certified 280 cooler models as meeting our performance standards. More than three-quarters of these certified models are more energy-efficient than legacy models, and 60% have a higher cooling capacity. Nearly 40% are certified to perform in hot or humid conditions. A project planned in 2020, commencing in 2021, will further improve our performance in this area, as we are improving the tracking of equipment in the marketplace to accelerate replacement of legacy fleet to reduce impact per cooler.

Case Study:

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

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

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

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

C3.1a

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

	Is your low-carbon transition plan a scheduled resolution item at AGMs?	Comment
Row 1	No, and we do not intend it to become a scheduled resolution item within the next two years	Our Environmental, Social, Governance and Public Policy Committee of the Board of Directors approves our long-term plans but we don't take them forward to the full meeting for the shareholders.

C3.2

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

Yes, qualitative and quantitative

C3.2a

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

Climate-related scenarios and models applied	Details
IEA NPS REMIND	<p>In 2018-2019, The Coca-Cola Company conducted a thorough climate-related risk priority assessment, according to the framework recommended by the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and assessed Acute physical, Chronic physical and Transitional risks across a 10-year timescale.</p> <p>Two key climate-related risks were selected from this list of risks, and a qualitative and quantitative scenario analysis were conducted, using a business-as-usual (IEA NPS) and a 2-degree scenario (REMIND). These scenarios were chosen because they contain the most relevant data points for further analysis, and their assumptions around energy demand, population growth and carbon pricing were most relevant. Additionally, we assessed the likelihood and frequency by which these scenarios will be updated, and the comparability to other datasets.</p> <p>Both our assessment and scenario analysis consider a 2030 timeline. The scenarios have 2040 timelines, but these are extrapolated down to 2030, where appropriate. The 2030 timeline was chosen, as our current sustainability targets are set on a 2030 time horizon.</p> <p>Areas of the business considered within the scenario analysis include our procurement function, Sustainability function, R&D, bottling partners' operations, and technical and supply chain functions, as well as enterprise risk management, finance and insurance functions.</p> <p>The results of the scenario analyses on the 2 climate-related risks are below:</p>

	<p>(1) Extreme weather events disrupting production and limiting distribution: one-off extreme events pose significant potential impact resulting from significant off line periods or cost of activating alternative supply routes. For example, in 2017 - 2018, three major natural disasters impacted the business, within an 18-month timespan: Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Maria, and the Japanese floods. The overall estimated loss value of these events was approximately USD 100 million. The scenarios do not provide a quantitative indication of future trends, but both the frequency and severity of these events are expected to increase dramatically in the business-as-usual scenario and meaningfully in the 2-degrees scenario, providing several scenarios of the future, and a qualitative picture of the potential increased exposure.</p> <p>(2) GHG and/or water regulations increasing COGS (GHG) or disrupting production: The Coca-Cola system emits GHGs across the value chain, and a price on carbon would have an impact to the business, particularly on areas of the system that are energy-intensive. At the moment, our analyses indicate only mild exposure to this risk. Nonetheless, we estimate up to USD 700 million potential exposure by 2030, based on calculations using the IEA/NPS and REMIND 2 degree scenarios.</p> <p>The results of this scenario analysis directly influenced our strategic decision to set a science-based target in 2019, which aims to reduce absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions 25% by 2030 from a 2015 base year.</p> <p>Case study of how the results have influenced our business strategy: In response to the potential exposure to carbon pricing costs of USD 700 million identified in an internal analysis, one of our key interventions is to invest in renewable energy, with many operating units having made investments and/or implemented renewable electricity or energy goals with significant progress realized. We created a Renewable Energy Guide to help local teams make informed decisions on potential investments, and we have been working locally in several markets to embrace renewable energy initiatives. In 2019, 15% of our system’s electricity demand was met with renewable sources. In 2020, we increased that to 17%.</p>
--	---

C3.3

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

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence

<p>Products and services</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Packaging accounts for roughly 25-30% of the GHG emissions across our value chain. As such, there is a significant abatement opportunity through recycling and the use of recycled materials in our product packaging.</p> <p>In 2017, our Company prepared a waste and circular economy strategy called World Without Waste, with an official launch in January 2018. The program set goals for our business to help collect a package for every one we sell, and to move toward 50% recycled material use in all of our consumer packaging globally by 2030, a time horizon of 10+ years.</p> <p>The opportunity of lower emissions that the use of recycled PET in packaging provides, in part led to the most substantial strategic decision made in this area to date that has been influenced by climate-related risks and opportunities to set a goal of 50% recycled material use in all of our consumer packaging globally by 2030, with our climate and packaging goals mutually reinforcing .</p> <p>Below are examples of products that have been introduced to help drive our business toward this goal: As of January 2020, local water brands in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Hong Kong, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and Uruguay are now making bottles for water brands from 100% recycled plastic (this refers to the material from which the plastic bottle is made, not the cap and label). Across Western Europe smartwater® and Honest® tea bottles are now made with 100% recycled PET plastic. From the end of 2019, in Australia seven out of 10 bottles are now being made entirely from recycled plastic. The same is true for all bottles in New Zealand under 1 liter. And in multiple markets, Sprite® bottles were changed from green to clear to improve the efficiency of the recycling system. Dasani® in the United States launched a series of initiatives designed to reduce plastic waste and increase the use of recycled and renewable materials. These included a new hybrid bottle made with a mix of up to 50% plant-based and recycled PET plastic.</p>
------------------------------	------------	---

<p>Supply chain and/or value chain</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Ingredients used in our products account for roughly 20% of our GHG emissions and, based on our climate-related risk assessment, which was conducted on a 2030-time horizon (10+1 years), the impact of chronic physical risks limiting the availability of ingredients and raw materials in our supply chains was a key risk with potential to impact a broad set of products and markets and our long-term growth strategies.</p> <p>Our procurement director for sustainable ag is embedded in our procurement organization and works with our buyers, suppliers and bottlers to integrate climate into our long-term buying plans. We will explore climate adaptation projects with ingredient suppliers in vulnerable areas as we execute our long-term strategy.</p> <p>We work with suppliers to meet the standards for environmental protection and responsible farm management required in our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP). Suppliers must demonstrate they meet SAGP criteria using global sustainable agriculture standards and assurance schemes. We track SAGP compliance of our priority agricultural ingredients, which represent about 80% of our total annual agricultural ingredient purchases. In 2020, 56% of these ingredient volumes were SAGP compliant. A 2019 peer-reviewed study, supported by WWF and The Coca-Cola Company, found that full adoption of the Bonsucro Standard, which is aligned with our SAGP, across the sugarcane sector would increase yields and cut GHG emissions in half while reducing total production area by 24%.</p> <p>A case study of the most substantial strategic decision made in this area to date that has been influenced by the climate-related risks and opportunities, is that due to the risk of chronic physical impacts limiting availability of ingredients/raw materials in our supply chain, we made the decision to include within our new Principles for Sustainable Agriculture (PSA) a number of expectations for our agriculture ingredient suppliers that help mitigate climate-related risks. These include expectations related to water management, soil management and conservation of natural habitats and ecosystems. Our future strategy is to work toward having 100% of our priority ingredients comply with our PSA.</p>
--	------------	--

Investment in R&D	Yes	<p>Emissions from refrigeration equipment account for roughly one third of the GHG emissions across our value chain. Therefore, this opportunity is assessed against a 2030 (10+1 years) time horizon, which is the target year for our science-based target. Additionally future regulations on carbon pricing and other climate-related regulations could influence the cost of refrigeration and improve the return of our investments in sustainable refrigeration. We continue to work towards having all our new purchases of coolers be HFC-free, and in 2020 83% of new coolers placed in customer outlets were HFC-free. The estimated investment-to-date for HFC-free coolers is approximately USD 100 million. There is a significant opportunity for investment in R&D in this area.</p> <p>A case study of the most substantial strategic decision made in this area to date that has been influenced by the climate-related risks and opportunities was to continue to include our refrigeration equipment emissions in the scope of our GHG emissions target as we transitioned to a science-based target in 2019. More than 99% of our refrigeration emissions are Scope 3 emissions, and the decision was made to continue to include refrigeration equipment in the scope of our target, at the same level of ambition as our Scope 1 and 2 emissions. In our previous GHG emissions targets, we have included our cooler emissions in the scope of our GHG emissions target, and this decision has driven improvement in our cooling equipment energy efficiency by 40% since 2000 through various investments.</p> <p>For example, in the wake of the March 2011 Tohoku earthquake and tsunami, Japan experienced scheduled blackouts. These blackouts impacted Coca-Cola's nearly 1 million vending machines installed in Japan, affecting the ability to provide cold drinks to customers. In response, Coca-Cola's Tokyo R&D division set out to design a machine that could dispense cold drinks after being shut down for up to 16 consecutive hours. The result was the "Peak Shift" vending machine. This machine is designed to only use power for cooling at night when electricity demand is lower and electricity systems experience fewer demand issues. The machines keep drinks cold while reducing daytime energy use by 95% and consuming 10% less</p>
-------------------	-----	--

		<p>energy overall than an average machine. This model is now standard for new vending machines installed in Japan.</p>
<p>Operations</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In our climate-related risk assessment, which was conducted on a 2030-time horizon (10+1 years), one of the identified top priority climate-related risks was the risk of GHG regulations increasing COGS. A price on carbon would have an impact to the full Coca-Cola system (the system), including bottling partners particularly in energy-intensive parts of the value chain. By 2030, we estimate an overall USD 700 million potential system exposure, based on the IEA/NPS and REMIND 2-degree scenarios. Of this impact, we expect that USD 284 million could come from impacts to manufacturing operations across our system, including our bottling partners.</p> <p>A case study of the most substantial strategic decision(s) made in this area to date that have been influenced by the climate-related risks and opportunities was that based on the findings of our climate risk assessments, we made a decision to adopt a science-based target for our global system, including bottling partners. We estimate the potential future impact of carbon pricing on our manufacturing operations could be mitigated by up to 50% by achieving this target. The focus of our climate strategy for our operations is for more energy efficiency and to switch to the use of more renewable energy. There are further opportunities to implementing energy efficiency strategies in our manufacturing operations including installing more energy efficient equipment and optimizing systems and processes at each facility.</p> <p>Many of our largest bottling partners have achieved ambitious renewable energy targets and many continue to set and make progress on renewable energy goals. For example, Coca-Cola Amatil committed to move to 100% renewable electricity across its entire operations by 2030. Coca-Cola Swire also aims for 100% of electricity from its operations to be from renewable sources by 2026. Coca-Cola European Partners has already achieved its target of purchasing 100% renewable electricity for its operations in 2018. We also created a Renewable Energy Guide to help local teams make informed decisions on potential investments, and we have been working locally in several markets to embrace renewable energy initiatives.</p>

C3.4

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

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	<p>Capital expenditures</p> <p>Capital allocation</p>	<p>Packaging accounts for roughly one third of the GHG emissions across our value chain. As such, there is a significant abatement opportunity through recycling and the use of recycled materials. In 2017, our Company launched a waste and circular economy strategy called World Without Waste. The program set goals for our business to help collect a package for every one we sell, and to move towards 50% recycled material use in all of our consumer packaging globally by 2030, a time horizon of 10+ years.</p> <p>A key consideration in setting these goals was the amount of GHG emissions we would be able to reduce, based on the use of recycled material and through post-consumer collection and recycling. These goals are expected to make a significant contribution to our science-based target, which includes Scope 3 emissions and therefore makes climate targets a critical consideration as our business delivers against our circular economy goals.</p> <p>Our company has a long-range planning process with a time horizon of 3 years. Geographical business unit presidents and their functional leadership initiate the process in Q2 each year to review global and regional long-range priorities over a timespan of 3 years. In Q3, plans for the following year are made, with involvement from all functions. In parallel, a global system meeting of leadership from both The Coca-Cola Company and our bottling partners are held to review strategic initiatives. An Enterprise Risk Management forum, composed of both The Coca-Cola Company and bottling partners also assesses long-term risks over this time horizon of 3 years and feeds into the overall planning process.</p> <p>In 2018-2019, within this planning process, many financial decisions related to capital expenditure and allocation have been made toward the progress of our World Without Waste program and the reduction of our GHG emissions footprint, over a time horizon of 3 years. All activity related to increasing collection and recycling rates and increased usage of recycled material have a direct impact on reducing Scope 3 GHG emissions, and therefore climate-related issues directly influence these financial decisions.</p>

	<p>There are three specific cases shared below:</p> <p>(1) In 2020, the American Beverage Association, along with industry partners Coca-Cola, PepsiCo and Keurig Dr Pepper, announced Dallas-Fort Worth as the first city to receive community recycling grants as part of the industry-launched Every Bottle Back initiative, launched in October 2019, with the goal to improve the collection and recycling of plastic bottles in the United States . Overall, nearly \$3 million will be invested in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex to support recycling infrastructure improvements, recycling access and education to single-family and multifamily homes. These investments are expected to yield 3 million pounds of newly recovered PET plastic annually. The Coca-Cola North America Public Affairs and Communications team developed a packaging, recycling and sustainability training for customer teams to empower them to lead sustainability and World Without Waste conversations with their customers. Training has rolled out to more than 500 Coca-Cola North America system employees to-date, including several of our largest franchise bottlers. There are plans to promote the training to all Coca-Cola North America system employees and to potentially scale the training to other markets.</p> <p>The partners also announced a total investment of \$910,500 in the cities of Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, and Kenosha, Wisconsin for the creation of a new curbside recycling program reaching 67,000 households with carts and recycling education materials. It's estimated the two new recycling programs will collect 178 million pounds of recyclable materials over 10 years, of which 2.1 million pounds will be aluminum and 7.9 million pounds will be polyethylene terephthalate (PET), both of which are used to make 100% recyclable cans and bottles from recycled content.</p> <p>(2) Southeast Asia has been identified a key region for plastic leakage into the ocean, based on studies by Jenna Jambeck of the University of Georgia in 2015. In order to help improve collection rates in this region, The Coca-Cola Company was a founding investor in Circulate Capital, which was created in collaboration with Closed Loop Partners, Ocean Conservancy, and a few other like-minded companies. In 2018, The Coca-Cola Company put \$15 million in the fund, and it was an early advocate within the industry. In 2020, we continued our partnership with Circulate Capital, who has reviewed more than 200 opportunities across South and Southeast Asia and has completed its first two investments. They are providing capital for local startups and small- and medium-sized enterprises focused on ending plastic pollution.</p> <p>(3) In 2020, Colombia and regions of Brazil adopted the “universal bottle” first introduced in 2018 by Coca-Cola Brazil and in use in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Guatemala and Panama. It drives</p>
--	---

		<p>efficiency of collection, cleaning and filling by offering multiple brands in the same reusable bottle with a single color, shape and size. In Brazil, 2-liter “universal” bottles of Coca-Cola, Fanta and Sprite can be returned, cleaned and refilled up to 25 times and are replacing 200 million nonrefillable bottles each year.</p> <p>Other markets, particularly in Latin America, Africa and Europe, are also increasing refillables. As of 2020, reusable bottles represented 27% of sales in Coca-Cola Latin America and were the fastest-growing packaging format in 2018 and 2019. In Chile, for example, we partnered with Petrobras in 2020 to launch a pilot to sell returnable bottles in convenience stores, supporting reuse and a circular economy.</p> <p>Coca-Cola Beverages South Africa (CCBSA) expanded the rollout of a 2-liter refillable PET (RefPET) plastic bottle following a successful pilot in 2019 along the Eastern Cape. The packages, which include a paper label with “returnable” appearing in a green strip, can be cleaned, refilled and reused up to 14 times before being recycled and made into new PET bottles. Coca-Cola Peninsula Beverages (PenBev), our bottling partner for the country’s Western Cape, offers a 1.5-liter RefPET bottle. These initiatives incentivize consumers to reduce waste and boosts overall PET collection efforts.</p>
--	--	--

C3.4a

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

None

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

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

Both absolute and intensity targets

C4.1a

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

Target reference number

Abs 1

Year target was set

2019

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

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

Base year

2015

Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO₂e)

64,381,160

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

100

Target year

2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

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

48,285,870

Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

56,191,997

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

50.8792510107

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

2°C aligned

Please explain (including target coverage)

We continue to evaluate and make changes in our operations and throughout the Coca-Cola system value chain to reduce our climate impact. This target is a Coca-Cola System level target, including The Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners. The target brings our diverse sustainability initiatives under one goal to reduce the carbon footprint across the Coca-Cola system's full value chain by 25% by 2030, in absolute terms. Progress toward reducing the greenhouse gas emissions across our manufacturing processes, packaging formats, delivery fleet, refrigeration equipment and

ingredient sourcing has been measured under an intensity target (target Int 1) from 2010 to 2020. This target, recently made public in 2019, is a Science-Based Target, and an absolute reduction target consistent with reductions required to keep warming to 2°C. Due to the nature of our franchise bottling system, in this CDP response, our manufacturing emissions are normally split between Scopes 1 and 2 for company-owned facilities and Scope 3 for bottling partner facilities. However, in our “drink in your hand” (intensity target) calculations, as well as this absolute reduction target, we consider the full Coca-Cola system (including franchise bottling partners) in the calculation of our manufacturing, distribution and refrigeration emissions.

C4.1b

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

Target reference number

Int 1

Year target was set

2013

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)

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

Intensity metric

Other, please specify

Grams CO₂e per liter of beverage sold

Base year

2010

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

463

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

100

Target year

2020

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

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

347.25

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

-7

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-10

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

346

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]

101.0799136069

Target status in reporting year

Achieved

Is this a science-based target?

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

Target ambition

Please explain (including target coverage)

The target was to reduce relative carbon emissions of the "drink in your hand" by 25 percent by 2020. This target was a Coca-Cola System level target, including The Coca-Cola Company and its bottling partners, and included Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. In 2020 the System successfully achieved this goal with a 25 percent relative carbon emissions reduction of the "drink in your hand" compared to a 2010 baseline.

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

C4.2

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

No other climate-related targets

C4.3

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

Yes

C4.3a

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	0	0
To be implemented*	1	280
Implementation commenced*	3	8,546
Implemented*	21	16,233
Not to be implemented	0	0

C4.3b

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

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

23

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

2,789

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

New building air temperature reduction.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

222

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

32,503

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Optimization of all CIP sets.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

107

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

38,312

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Water by demand temperature optimization.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

142

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

50,764

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Dedicated chiller unit to meet juice trace cooling load.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

87

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

31,120

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Removed flush-out times when "cool to heat" and vice-versa.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

63

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

22,462

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

At the Ballina facility, upgraded valve stations in the ASRS chilled area.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

187

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

66,642

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

33,321

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Replacement of Ballina ASRS refrigeration system.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

195

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

69,586

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

34,793

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Compressor retrofit at the Ballina plant.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

72

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

25,840

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

12,920

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Direct drive fans installed on HVAC units flow and return.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

259

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

92,416

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

46,208

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Lighting retrofits.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

8

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

2,743

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

1,371

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Replacement of manifold Ross valves.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

13

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

4,636

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

2,318

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Humidity controls for ingredients on supply.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation
Solid biofuels

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1,494

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

219,990

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Improvement of CHP efficient at the Ballina plant.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

44

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

6,414

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

3,207

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Exhaust gas analyzers on boiler.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

101

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

36,180

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

18,080

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

New building HVAC system air intakes size increased.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation
Solar PV

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

15

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

18,000

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

80,000

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Solar PV pilot installation at CPS Manaus.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change
Supplier engagement

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

8,780

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

158,690

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Wind PPA at Goblej, Chennai, and additional Wind PPA at Bidadi plants.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation
Solar PV

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

865

Scope(s)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

113,050

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

0

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

21-30 years

Comment

Solar rooftop installation at Sanand Plant.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Fuel switch

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

1,318

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

30,800

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

84,000

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Boiler conversion from heavy oil to piped natural gas at Bidadi.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption
Solid biofuels

Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)

1,900

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

245,000

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

1,680,000

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

New biomass boiler commissioned at Chennai plant.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

338

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

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

376,583

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

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

>30 years

Comment

Temperature reduction in return water to CHP engine.

C4.3c

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

Method	Comment
--------	---------

<p>Internal incentives/recognition programs</p>	<p>The Coca-Cola Company collaborated with WWF (World Wildlife Fund) to develop a Top 10 Energy Efficiency practices program for our plants to implement. By the end of 2017, 801 plants had registered in the Top 10 program, and 1/3 of the plants had completed the energy efficiency top 10 challenge, entitling them to public recognition for the plants and/or organizations that successfully completed all practices, helping bottlers yield reputation value from their environmental work. Additionally, more than 50% of the plants have implemented 7 out of 10 energy efficiency measures.</p> <p>Implementing the top 10 projects at all plants will contribute toward our 2020 value-chain carbon target to reduce the emissions from “the drink in your hand” by 25%.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>TCCC and its bottling partners have internal governance structures to facilitate communication and strategy, share best-practice, and recognize achievements within our bottling operations across the globe. There are monthly conference calls to convene relevant staff globally on energy efficiency, energy reduction, and renewable energy projects facilitated by our global technical team, which convenes monthly and annually in-person to share best practice and recognize achievements, as well as formulate strategies on progressing emissions reduction and energy reduction on a monthly basis.</p> <p>In 2016, a clean energy assessment, conducted through this governance structure, provided strategic, locally-relevant insights into drivers and barriers to clean energy investments at our bottling partners, allowing the Company to build insights on clean energy, as well as develop a toolbox to provide Business Units and bottling partners with financial and technical assessment capabilities on clean energy investments to develop locally-relevant strategies. Additionally, an energy risk assessment framework and model has been developed through the collaborative governance structure, which allows insight into local and regional energy risks and investment opportunities, which are then aggregated and fed into business strategy.</p>

C4.5

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

Yes

C4.5a

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

Level of aggregation

Company-wide

Description of product/Group of products

The use of recycled material in our packaging results in significantly less carbon emissions compared to the use of virgin material, including PET plastic. In 2017, we set a target to move towards including an average of 50% recycled material globally in all of our primary packaging by 2030. In 2020 we achieved 22% across all materials and 11.5% for PET plastic which is our highest volume packaging material, constituting 45% of our total packaging material mix.

We now offer beverages packaged in 100% recycled PET plastic (rPET) in around 30 markets. In 2020, the Netherlands and Norway announced transitions to 100% rPET for their entire plastic packaging portfolios, joining their neighbors in Sweden. In early 2021, our North America business announced a series of 100% rPET innovations spanning our portfolio and including multiple brands and packaging sizes. Combined, these innovations will result in a 20% reduction in use of new (virgin) plastic across our North American portfolio compared to 2018 and collectively reduce an estimated 10,000 metric tons of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions annually. In Japan we introduced a label-less 100% rPET bottle for the I LOHAS natural mineral water brand, to simplify material sorting and recycling.

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

Low-carbon product and avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify

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

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

5

Comment

No additional comments.

Level of aggregation

Product

Description of product/Group of products

Coca-Cola Freestyle machines are fountain-like beverage dispensing machines that allow users to select from a large variety of beverages. The machines mix the beverages at the time of order, and dispense them into cups, reducing emissions associated with packaging, as well as plastic waste. We continue to expand this

“package-less” delivery model for beverages to more than 50,000 machines serving 14 million drinks daily, with continued expansion into Europe and Latin America. Based on a 2013 LCA study we estimate that every 1,000 liters sold via our Freestyle machines saves the environment 110 Kg of CO₂ emissions.

In 2020 we introduced our first touchless Freestyle machines in the United States, which allow consumers to choose and pour drinks from their phones in just a few seconds without the need to create an account or download an app.

Last year, we introduced DASANI PureFill 2.0, an innovative packageless dispensing platform that leverages the technology in Coca-Cola Freestyle to provide chilled, filtered DASANI water with customizable flavor options. We're adding more than 100 packageless water dispensers across the United States. In 2018, we launched the first Bonaqua Water Station in Hong Kong, and subsequently rolled out 84 more across the region in 2019. The stations allow customers to fill their own cups with Bonaqua's assortment of flavored waters and are being made available in a variety of locations including retail, work, and sports and entertainment venues.

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

Avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify

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

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

11

Comment

No additional comments.

Level of aggregation

Group of products

Description of product/Group of products

COVID-19 accelerated our focus on refillable packaging, which addresses both affordability and sustainability concerns. In 2020, Colombia and other new Brazilian territories adopted the “universal bottle” first developed by Coca-Cola Brazil to drive efficiency by using the same package for multiple core brands, an innovation now available in: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Guatemala and Panama. And, in Chile, we partnered with Petrobras to launch a pilot to sell returnable bottles in convenience stores. According to research conducted with Ipsos, the pandemic has made people more aware of packaging waste and driven preference for refillable packages. To address these trends and to continue to lower the carbon footprint from

our packaging, our global customer and commercial team is rolling out a holistic refillables strategy, including a guidebook to help markets implement localized plans.

As of 2020, reusable bottles represented more than 25% of sales in Coca-Cola Latin America and were the fastest-growing packaging format in 2018 and 2019.

In 40+ markets, refillables account for 25% or more of sales, and in 20+ markets, refillables account for 50% or more of our sales.

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

Low-carbon product and avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify

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

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

11

Comment

No additional comments.

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

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

Scope 1

Base year start

January 1, 2004

Base year end

December 31, 2004

Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

573,143

Comment

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2004

Base year end

December 31, 2004

Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

885,145

Comment

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2004

Base year end

December 31, 2004

Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

885,145

Comment

C5.2

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

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

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

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

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

793,460

Comment

C6.2

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

Row 1

Scope 2, location-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

Scope 2, market-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

Comment

C6.3

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

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based

802,707

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)

747,876

Comment

C6.4

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

Yes

C6.4a

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

Source

Direct emissions from stationary fuel consumption for warehouses and offices

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

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

Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded

Under materiality threshold.

Source

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

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Emissions are not relevant

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

Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded

Under materiality threshold.

C6.5

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

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

21,492,100

Emissions calculation methodology

Our calculations include key packaging and ingredient materials, including PET bottles, closures, and labels, aluminum and steel cans and can-ends, as well as glass bottles and crowns, sweeteners (including sugar), Carbon dioxide for carbonation, and other key agricultural ingredients. Volumes of each item are collected from our operations and bottling partners across the globe, and a global average emissions factor for each material is applied to calculate emissions. For packaging, the end-of-life impact is included, using a 50:50 allocation methodology between usage of recycled material and rates of recovery. The methodology is vetted internally and applied according to accepted international standards such as the GHG protocol. In addition, the data received from our bottling partners is reviewed internally for errors, and emissions factors are selected based on criteria such as source credibility or adherence to

internationally and scientifically accepted methodologies. However, neither the data nor the methodology behind this calculation have been verified externally.

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

100

Please explain

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

Capital goods

Evaluation status

Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

1,799,000

Emissions calculation methodology

Biointelligence Service Preparatory Studies for Eco-design, Commercial refrigerators and freezers, 2007, provides GWP data for production, use and waste phases for coolers and vendors. This data was divided by the lifetime of the equipment for annual estimates. Ecodesign for Commercial Refrigeration, JRC science and policy report Preparatory study update Final report, 2014 suggests 8-10 years as equipment lifetime. Based on numerous considerations, the lifetime of CDE equipment was adjusted to 10 years. The annual emissions data for production was then multiplied by the number of coolers and vendor units for emissions estimates. For fountains, an average ratio of production emissions over emissions from electricity consumption was applied to the actual electricity consumption of fountain equipment.

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

0

Please explain

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

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

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

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status

Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

0

Emissions calculation methodology

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

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

100

Please explain

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

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

Business travel

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

19,826

Emissions calculation methodology

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

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

100

Please explain

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

Employee commuting

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

2,514,372

Emissions calculation methodology

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

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

45

Please explain

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

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

20,456,130

Emissions calculation methodology

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

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

100

Please explain

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

Use of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

To the best of our knowledge, we don't have any relevant assets that are leased to 3rd parties.

Franchises

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO₂e

4,138,811

Emissions calculation methodology

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

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

96

Please explain

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

Investments

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

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

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

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

Yes

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

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

Activity

Agriculture/Forestry

Scope 3 category

Purchased goods and services

Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

11,157,972

Please explain

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

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

No

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

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

Agricultural commodities

Sugar

Do you collect or calculate GHG emissions for this commodity?

Yes

Please explain

Our calculations for sugar are based on consumption volumes from our operations and bottling partners across the globe, and a global average emissions factor applied to calculate emissions. The methodology is vetted internally and applied according to accepted international standards such as the GHG protocol. In addition, the data

received from our bottling partners is reviewed internally for errors, and emissions factors are selected based on criteria such as source credibility or adherence to internationally and scientifically accepted methodologies. However, neither the data nor the methodology behind this calculation have been verified externally.

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

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

Sugar

Reporting emissions by

Total

Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

6,003,583

Change from last reporting year

Lower

Please explain

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

C6.10

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

Intensity figure

0.00004669

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

1,541,336

Metric denominator

unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total

33,014,000,000

Scope 2 figure used

Market-based

% change from previous year

12

Direction of change

Increased

Reason for change

Absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions decreased; however, total revenue also decreased resulting in an increase in the intensity figure.

Intensity figure

19.19

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

1,541,336

Metric denominator

full time equivalent (FTE) employee

Metric denominator: Unit total

80,300

Scope 2 figure used

Market-based

% change from previous year

6

Direction of change

Increased

Reason for change

Absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions decreased; however, total full time equivalents also decreased resulting in an increased in the intensity figure.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

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

Yes

C7.1a

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO ₂ e)	GWP Reference
HFCs	14,043	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other, please specify HCFC-22	2,200	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
CO ₂	777,217	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

C7.2

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e)
Argentina	124
Bangladesh	8,791
Brazil	358
Cambodia	34,792
Canada	500
Chile	153
China	1,576
Comoros	452
Costa Rica	1,156
Egypt	195
Ethiopia	50,340
France	1,742
Ghana	16,561

India	54,266
Indonesia	18
Ireland	11,003
Japan	574
Kenya	37,542
Malaysia	18,785
Mayotte	296
Mexico	1
Mozambique	17,441
Myanmar	8,666
Namibia	10,782
Nepal	23,762
Pakistan	47
Philippines	121,510
Puerto Rico	1,678
Republic of Korea	59
Singapore	0
South Africa	76,269
Sri Lanka	4,079
Eswatini	630
Turkey	17,576
Uganda	13,387
United Republic of Tanzania	17,938
United States of America	182,659
Viet Nam	40,372
Other, please specify Corporate Aircraft	2,925
Other, please specify Rest of World - Refrigerants	2,403
Zambia	5,922
Botswana	1,983
Qatar	4,004
Australia	143

C7.3

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

By business division

By activity

C7.3a

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

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Commercial Product Supply	17,627
Bottler Investments Group	125,909
Coca-Cola North America	112,542
Syrup	36,740
TCCC	796
Immediate Consumption Equipment	16,243
International Airspace - Corporate Aircraft	2,925
Fleet (Distribution)	480,678

C7.3c

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Manufacturing	293,614
Fleet (distribution)	480,678
International Airspace - Corporate Aircraft	2,925
Immediate Consumption Equipment	16,243

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

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

Yes

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

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

Activity

Processing/Manufacturing

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

293,614

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

Scope 1 processing/manufacturing emissions.

Activity

Distribution

Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

480,678

Methodology

Default emissions factor

Please explain

Scope 1 distribution emissions.

C7.5

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in Scope 2 market-based approach (MWh)
Argentina	1,032	1,036	2,873	0
Bangladesh	4,173	4,190	7,578	0
Brazil	1,175	1,179	10,550	0
Cambodia	4,215	4,232	9,307	0
Canada	1,315	1,320	8,933	0
Chile	853	856	1,903	0
China	5,167	5,188	7,518	0
Comoros	192	193	475	0
Costa Rica	100	101	9,657	0
Egypt	1,395	1,401	2,575	0

Ethiopia	3	3	9,072	0
France	564	442	9,173	0
Ghana	1,845	1,852	7,173	0
India	149,927	117,590	177,174	38,899
Indonesia	598	601	700	0
Ireland	4,013	6,019	10,874	0
Japan	1,441	1,447	2,572	0
Kenya	4,843	4,862	26,666	0
Malaysia	24,410	24,507	33,053	0
Mayotte	437	439	950	0
Mexico	2,298	2,307	4,514	0
Mozambique	1,007	1,011	12,044	0
Myanmar	5,389	5,410	13,678	0
Namibia	190	191	7,072	0
Nepal	0	0	6,193	785
Pakistan	240	241	548	0
Philippines	180,593	154,760	123,924	33,740
Puerto Rico	11,642	11,688	11,576	0
Republic of Korea	387	388	648	0
Singapore	3,191	3,204	7,350	0
South Africa	149,276	149,868	139,119	0
Sri Lanka	2,794	2,805	4,900	0
Eswatini	1,616	1,622	3,999	0
Turkey	928	530	1,785	770
Uganda	9,899	9,938	21,303	0
United Republic of Tanzania	4,786	4,805	12,846	0
United States of America	188,555	189,304	409,393	0
Viet Nam	22,548	22,637	65,452	0
Zambia	2,049	2,057	10,332	0
Botswana	5,300	5,321	3,335	0
Australia	381	383	480	0
Qatar	1,940	1,948	3,646	0

C7.6

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

By business division

By activity

C7.6a

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

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Commercial Product Supply	34,548	36,212
Bottler Investment Group	544,870	488,734
Coca-Cola North America	198,693	198,693
Syrup	22,690	22,689
TCCC	1,906	1,548

C7.6c

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

Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Manufacturing	802,707	747,876

C7.9

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

Decreased

C7.9a

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

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
--	--	---------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------

Change in renewable energy consumption	3,110	Decreased	0.2	The change in emissions from 2019 to 2020 due to renewable energy consumption was 3,110 MT CO ₂ e, and the total emissions reported for Scope 1 and 2 (location based) in 2019 was 1,558,901 MT CO ₂ e. Therefore the percent change due to renewable energy consumption is: $(-3,110/1,558,901)*100\% = 0.2\%$.
Other emissions reduction activities	16,233	Decreased	1	Based on the total emissions reported for Scope 1 and 2 (location based) in 2019 of 1,558,901 MT CO ₂ e and the total reported emission reduction activities of 16,233 MT CO ₂ e, the percentage change in emissions due to emissions reduction activities is: $(-16,233/1,558,901) * 100\% = -1\%$. This represents a 1.0% decrease in emissions due to emissions reduction activities.
Divestment	0	No change	0	
Acquisitions	3,490	Increased	0.2	The total emissions from newly acquired facilities is 3,490 MT CO ₂ e. The percentage change in emissions due to acquisitions is $(3,490/1,558,901)*100\% = 0\%$. This represents a 0.2% increase in emissions due to acquisitions.
Mergers	0	No change	0	
Change in output	0	No change	0	
Change in methodology	0	No change	0	
Change in boundary	0	No change	0	
Change in physical operating conditions	0	No change	0	
Unidentified	1,712	Increased	0.1	The change in emissions from 2019 to 2020 was 7,175 MT CO ₂ e. Taking into account the emissions associated with emission reduction activities, acquisitions, and renewable energy consumption there is an increase in emissions of 15,853 MY

				Co2e that is unidentified. (17,565 - 16,233 + 3,490 - 3,110 = 1,712). The percent change in emissions that is unidentified is (2,712/1,558,901)*100% = 0.1%
Other	0	No change	0	

C7.9b

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

Market-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

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

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

C8.2

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

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

C8.2a

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

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	HHV (higher heating value)	114,430	1,220,297	1,334,726
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity		74,194	1,135,243	1,209,437
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam		21,338	0	21,338
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy		11,415		11,415
Total energy consumption		221,377	2,355,539	2,576,916

C8.2b

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

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

C8.2c

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

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Light Fuel Oil

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

227,485

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

227,485

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

70.4

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Heavy Fuel Oil

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

101,652

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

101,652

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

73.5

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Kerosene

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

8

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

8

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

68.27

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Natural Gas

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

786,270

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

786,270

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

0

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

58,915

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

58,915

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

59.4

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

GHG Protocol GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Bituminous Coal

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

44,203

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

44,203

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

89.93

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

B5 Biodiesel

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1,855

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1,855

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

67.12

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

Other, please specify

Biomass

Heating value

HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

114,338

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

114,338

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

Emission factor

1.84

Unit

kg CO2 per GJ

Emissions factor source

IPCC GCV (HHV)

Comment

C8.2d

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

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	11,415	11,415	11,415	11,415
Heat	1,334,745	1,334,745	116,211	116,211
Steam	0	0	0	0
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2e

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

Sourcing method

Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator with energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Low-carbon energy mix

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

India

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

38,899

Comment

Sourcing method

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

Low-carbon technology type

Hydropower

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

Nepal

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

785

Comment

Sourcing method

Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator with energy attribute certificates

Low-carbon technology type

Geothermal

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

Philippines

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

33,740

Comment

Sourcing method

Unbundled energy attribute certificates, Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs)

Low-carbon technology type

Hydropower

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

Turkey

MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor

770

Comment

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

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

C10. Verification

C10.1

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

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

C10.1a

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

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 20 KO - EY_CDP_Accountants Report.pdf

Page/ section reference

page 1-2

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

39

C10.1b

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

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 20 KO - EY_CDP_Accountants Report.pdf

Page/ section reference

page 1-2

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.1c

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

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Franchises

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 20 KO - EY_CDP_Accountants Report.pdf

Page/section reference

page 1-2

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Business travel

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

 20 KO - EY_CDP_Accountants Report.pdf

Page/section reference

page 1-2

Relevant standard

Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.2

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

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

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

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

Yes

C11.1a

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

California CaT - ETS

C11.1b

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

California CaT

% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

100

% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

100

Period start date

January 1, 2020

Period end date

December 31, 2020

Allowances allocated

Allowances purchased

Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO₂e

20,654

Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO₂e

37,943

Details of ownership

Other, please specify

The facilities that operate under the California CaT ETS are owned and operated by The Coca-Cola Company and our franchise bottling partner, Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling, L.L.C

Comment

Ownership includes Company and bottler-owned and operated facilities in California. The scope 1 and 2 emissions data provided is an estimate of emissions from The Coca-Cola System's manufacturing plants in California.

C11.1d

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

We set a science-based target to reduce absolute Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions by 25% by 2030. We also support a vision to be net zero carbon by 2050, and our science-based target is a critical milestone that supports this longer-term ambition. The work we are doing through sustainable agriculture and product reformulations will help us to achieve the target. As we look at our ingredients, we are assessing which have the highest GHG footprint, and then putting in place plans to switch ingredients and work with suppliers to reduce our impact. Likewise, our investments in renewable energy, combined with increased adoption of low-carbon technologies, will contribute. And, since packaging accounts for almost one-third of our overall carbon footprint, our World Without Waste strategy is essential for us to meet this target. By developing advanced, plant-based packaging that requires less petroleum-based virgin plastic, through light-weighting our packaging, by focusing on refillable, fountain and Coca-Cola Freestyle solutions, and by investing in local recycling programs to collect old bottles so they can become new ones, we are lowering our carbon footprint to contribute to this target.

We estimate that manufacturing currently accounts for as much as 15% of our GHG emissions. To this end, we created a Renewable Energy Guide to help local teams make informed decisions on potential investments, and we have been working locally in several markets to embrace renewable energy initiatives. These efforts are having an impact. In 2019, 15% of our system's electricity demand was met with renewable sources. In 2020, we increased that to 17%.

Beyond packaging efforts and agricultural procurement, we are implementing more robust supplier engagement programs on cold drink equipment and renewable energy. And, several of our bottling

partners have announced their own science-based targets, which will help drive even more positive climate action across the Coca-Cola system. These include Coca-Cola European Partners, Swire Coca-Cola Limited (Asia), Coca-Cola FEMSA (Mexico) and Coca-Cola Hellenic Bottling Company AG (Switzerland).

The Coca-Cola system operates in 46 national and 32 subnational jurisdictions regulated by some type of carbon pricing or carbon trading scheme. As a case study, roughly 15 years ago, California enacted an emission trading scheme (ETS) to help reduce its carbon emissions. The ETS was adopted as part of a broader suite of climate related initiatives the state has launched since the 1970s. The Coca-Cola system, principally through its bottler, the Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling Company, operates throughout the state of California. Our current impact (Scopes 1 and 2) of the California ETS is limited but primarily comes from fuel usage at our bottling facilities, which are primarily used as inputs to thermal heating and on-site electrical generation equipment. The Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling Company has also undertaken unique initiatives such as investments in alternative and clean energy fuels and uses hybrid vehicles, hydrogen fuel cells and electric trucks. Fifteen Reyes Coca-Cola Bottling facilities upgraded to LED lighting, which will save more than 2.4 million kilowatts annually. These investments mitigate

the system's overall carbon footprint in the state. Total emissions (Scope 1, 2 and 3) for the Coca-Cola system in California are calculated to be 502,278 CO₂eMT.

C11.2

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

No

C11.3

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

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

C12. Engagement

C12.1

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

Yes, our suppliers

Yes, our customers

C12.1a

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

Type of engagement

Information collection (understanding supplier behavior)

Details of engagement

Collect climate change and carbon information at least annually from suppliers

% of suppliers by number

10

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

70

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

70

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Between 45 and 55% of our carbon footprint across our value chain is with our ingredients and packaging that we purchase (Scope 3 purchased goods and services). It is therefore essential that we collect climate change and carbon information from suppliers of these commodities in order to inform our supplier evaluation process and

decision-making, and discussions with suppliers on carbon reduction initiatives and targets. Our collection of supplier carbon data is focused primarily on suppliers of aluminum, sugar, PET plastic and glass as these commodities have the largest impact on our supply chain carbon footprint.

In 2020, we requested 149 key suppliers to disclose to CDP's Climate questionnaire and 100 submitted. Fifteen suppliers indicated they have already set science-based targets of their own. The disclosure helps us to understand their current state of activity in GHG emissions reduction, such as target-setting, use of renewable energy and energy efficiency activities. We analyze supplier responses, and share this information with our procurement team who, along with a range of other sustainability metrics, use the data to score and benchmark suppliers on their sustainability performance. The sustainability performance of suppliers is then combined with other data points and is used to inform discussions with suppliers, as well as sourcing decisions by our procurement team.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

The impact of the engagement was the collection of climate change and carbon information from 100 suppliers in 2020, which enabled us to understand that 32 suppliers have structured climate targets, including 9 with approved SBTs and 23 who have intentions to set SBTs within 2 years. We use this information as a foundation for discussions with suppliers on setting structured climate targets and carbon reduction initiatives.

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

Success is measured by the percentage of suppliers who respond out of the total number of suppliers requested to respond to the CDP Climate Change questionnaire. We target a 100% response rate. 100 (67%) out of a total of 149 suppliers responded to the CDP Climate Change questionnaire in 2020. This was slightly down from 105 supplier responses in 2019 (70%) out of a requested total of 150.

Comment

Type of engagement

Compliance & onboarding

Details of engagement

Code of conduct featuring climate change KPIs

% of suppliers by number

100

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

100

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

100

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

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

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

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

In 2020, we increased our sustainable sourcing of our 12 priority agricultural ingredients to 56%, compared to 54% in 2019. Sugar, which is our number one agricultural commodity by volume, includes sugarcane, corn and beet sugar. We sourced 31% of sugarcane from farms certified as compliant with our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles, a decrease of 1% compared to 2019, 67% of our corn (same as 2019), and 83% of beet sugar (up from 69% in 2019). A peer-reviewed study published in 2019, supported by the global partnership of WWF and The Coca-Cola Company, found that full adoption of the Bonsucro Standard, which is aligned with our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles, across the sugarcane sector would cut GHG emissions in half while reducing total production area by 24%.

Comment

C12.1b

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

Type of engagement

Collaboration & innovation

Details of engagement

Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce climate change impacts

% of customers by number

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

1.6

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

Greenhouse Gas emissions from cold drink equipment account for 30-35% of emissions across our value chain. We work closely with our major retail customers and bottlers on innovations to reduce GHG emissions from cold drink equipment, through the placement of HFC-free and more energy efficient cold drink equipment. In 2020, 83% of all new coolers placed were HFC-free, which accounts for 1.6% of The Coca-Cola System's scope 3 emissions "processing of sold products", which represents emissions from cold drink equipment.

HFC-free coolers help to reduce direct GHG emissions by using HFC-free insulation foam. We also improve the energy efficiency of cold drink equipment in part by using intelligent energy management devices and other modifications such as the use of LED lighting. Our goal is for all new cold drink equipment placed with our retail customers to be HFC-free and each year we seek to maximize the number of customers we are able to engage with this equipment because this will result in the largest reduction of scope 3 GHG emissions possible.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

Success is measured by the percentage of our newly purchased cold drink equipment that is HFC-free. In 2020, 571,753 pieces of HFC-free cold drink equipment were placed in retail customer outlets, which constituted 83% of all coolers introduced in that year. These coolers eliminate the direct emission of HFCs, which contribute to global warming up to 4,000 times more than CO₂, and as they are more energy efficient compared to the coolers they are replacing, also reduce energy use (scope 2 emissions) for our retail customers. Our goal is for 100% of all new cold drink equipment purchases to be HFC-free, and we continue to make progress towards this goal, with 83% in 2020.

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

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

Yes

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

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

Management practice reference number

MP1

Management practice

Other, please specify

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

Description of management practice

Approximately 85% of our overall carbon footprint lies in our supply chain. Therefore, engaging suppliers is critical to achieving our science-based target.

In 2020, we requested 149 key suppliers to disclose to CDP's Climate questionnaire and 100 submitted. Nine suppliers indicated they have already set science-based targets of their own.

We are committed to working with our suppliers to promote sustainable agricultural practices and build supplier capabilities to meet the standards set out in our Sustainable Agriculture Guiding Principles (SAGP). Our SAGP include maximizing energy efficiency and use of renewable energy in agricultural practices, responsible forest management practices which protect biodiversity and restore degraded ecosystems, maintaining or improving soils by preventing degradation, and the safe and proper use of all agrochemicals. We encourage our suppliers to demonstrate they are meeting the SAGP criteria by using global sustainable agriculture standards and assurance schemes. The Farm Sustainability Assessment of the Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform, the Bonsucro sustainable sugarcane standard and Rainforest Alliance certifications are some of the leading standards we support. As climate change leads to more erratic and extreme weather, more sustainable agricultural practices will play a vital role in promoting resilience across our supply chain and in the communities that provide our agricultural ingredients.

In 2020, we introduced a supplier self-assessment questionnaire that was distributed to our ~200 juice suppliers for our top 5 fruits- apple, mango, grape, orange, lemon. We received responses from ~130 suppliers. The questionnaire allows the company to assess supplier's level of compliance with our SAGPs. Following the completion of the questionnaire we review and validate supplier responses during on-site audits. These audits take place typically every 3-4 years but depends on the risk rating of the supplier. In addition, in 2020 we began implementing a new sustainable agriculture data

assurance process using a Supplier Letter of Attestation. This letter is completed and approved by suppliers and provides details of the percentage of volume of agriculture ingredients supplied to Coca-Cola that comply with SAGPs, the country of origin and details of relevant certification /standards that are met.

Your role in the implementation

Procurement

Explanation of how you encourage implementation

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

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

Climate change related benefit

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

Comment

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

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

Yes

C12.3

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

- Direct engagement with policy makers
- Trade associations
- Other

C12.3a

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

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

C12.3b

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

Yes

C12.3c

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

Trade association

Consumer Goods Forum

Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Please explain the trade association's position

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

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

Our Company was instrumental in securing an HFC-free commitment on behalf of the full CGF membership in 2010 and helped coordinate three Refrigeration Summits for

CGF Members to advance progress on these commitments. Our Chairman and CEO is Co-Chair of the CGF's Board of Directors.

C12.3e

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

In 2020, we took steps to support several policy positions that align with our climate reduction targets. We were part of the working group that developed the Business Roundtable's (BRT) updated climate position announced in October 2020. The statement outlines high-level climate actions U.S. federal policymakers can take and calls for public/private partnerships to achieve the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions outlined in the Paris Agreement. We also joined a coalition of companies in successfully petitioning the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to update its policy on climate change. We sent a letter encouraging the Chamber to embrace the BRT statement and continue to play an active role in both the Chamber's Climate Task Force Advisory Group and Climate Solutions Working Group. We supported "America Is All In," a statement made by the "We Are Still In" movement calling on U.S. President Joe Biden and his administration to rejoin the Paris Agreement. The coalition of nearly 4,000 NGO, business, government and civil society leaders (with coordination from WWF) supports aggressive plans to address the dual threats of climate change and COVID-19.

For over a decade, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and The Coca-Cola Company have partnered to improve the health of freshwater basins and the environmental performance across Coca-Cola's supply chain, emissions and packaging. Together, we help create a more climate-resilient and water-secure future. We engaged regularly with WWF on the development of our science-based target. We work with BSR to examine what climate risk and resilience might mean for our value chain. Through our work with BSR we aim to build the foundation for a more resilient company that is better able to anticipate, avoid, accommodate and recover from climate risks in the future. In 2020, our CEO joined Dame Ellen MacArthur and more than 50 other business, government and non-profit leaders in signing a joint statement emphasizing the need to focus on developing a circular economy during these unprecedented times, which was published in the Financial Times. Coca-Cola, together with other peer companies pushed for this joint statement, emphasizing the need to stay focused on our long-term sustainability goals for our business, our communities and the planet. The Coca-Cola Company was a founding investor in Circulate Capital, which was created in collaboration with Closed Loop Partners, Ocean Conservancy and other like-minded companies. In 2018, The Coca-Cola Company put \$15 million in the fund, and was an early advocate within the industry. In 2020, we continued our partnership with Circulate Capital, which has reviewed more than 200 opportunities across South and Southeast Asia and has completed its first two investments. They are providing capital for local start-ups and small- and medium-sized enterprises focused on ending plastic pollution. The Coca-Cola Company is a strategic partner of the World Economic Forum (WEF), which was founded upon the notion that corporations not only have a duty to their shareholders, but they are also responsible for all of their stakeholders – including society at-large. Our CEO often joins panels and events to lend his voice on key sustainability topics including transforming the plastics economy.

C12.3f

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

A cross-functional core team, consisting of representatives from Sustainability, Legal, Public Affairs, Technical, Procurement, R&D, our bottling partners and our 9 geographical Operating Units, meets each month to discuss global climate strategy, climate policy and policy engagement activities, and stakeholder engagement across all geographies where we operate. All direct and indirect climate-related policy engagement activities are reviewed to ensure they are supportive and consistent with the Company's climate protection strategy. The cross-functional team takes outputs from these discussions and elevates issues as necessary to the Company's Leadership Team, Enterprise Risk Management and Board of Directors.

C12.4

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

Publication

In mainstream reports

Status

Complete

Attach the document

 Coca-Cola 2020 Business & Environmental, Social and Governance Report.pdf

Page/Section reference

- p. 36: Emission reduction targets, progress and strategy.
- p. 37: Estimated share of carbon emissions.
- p. 38: Climate change governance.
- p. 38: Climate risks and impacts aligned with the TCFD recommendations.
- p. 38: Approach to resilience.
- p. 38: Climate scenario analysis.
- p. 39: Supplier engagements advancing climate action.

Content elements

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets

Other metrics

Comment

C13. Other land management impacts

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

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

No

C15. Signoff

C-FI

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

None

C15.1

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

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

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

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

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms