Colgate Palmolive Company - Climate Change 2019

C0. Introduction

C0.1

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

Founded in 1806, Colgate-Palmolive is a publicly traded consumer products company with approximately $15.5 billion of worldwide net sales in 2018, serving people around the world with well-known brands that make their lives healthier and more enjoyable.

Colgate manufactures and markets a wide variety of products in the U.S. and around the world in two product segments: Oral, Personal and Home Care; and Pet Nutrition. Oral, Personal and Home Care products include toothpaste, toothbrushes and mouthwash, bar and liquid hand soaps, shower gels, shampoos, conditioners, deodorants and antiperspirants, laundry and dishwashing detergents, fabric conditioners, household cleaners and other similar items. These products are sold primarily to a variety of traditional and e-commerce retailers, wholesalers and distributors worldwide. Pet Nutrition products include specialty pet nutrition products manufactured and marketed by Hill's Pet Nutrition. The principal customers for Pet Nutrition products are authorized pet supply retailers, veterinarians and e-commerce retailers. Principal global and regional trademarks include Colgate, Palmolive, elmex, Tom's of Maine, Sorriso, Speed Stick, Lady Speed Stick, Softsoap, Irish Spring, Protex, Sanex, EltaMD, PCA Skin, Ajax, Axion, Fabuloso, Soupline and Suavitel, as well as Hill's Science Diet and Hill's Prescription Diet.

At Colgate, we understand the potential consequences of climate change, and we are committed to acting responsibly and conscientiously to protect people and the environment wherever we operate. We recognize that businesses and their suppliers, customers and consumers along with other stakeholders have a vital role to play in addressing the global issue of climate change and we are committed to continuously improving our greenhouse gas accounting processes, our performance and our governance around this challenge.

In 2014, Colgate made a bold commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002, with a longer term goal of a 50% absolute reduction by 2050 compared to 2002. These goals are in line with the CDP and World Wildlife Fund report – The 3% Solution - and will allow us to play our part in limiting global warming to 2°C, as recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

More recently, Colgate expanded this commitment to include Scope 3 emissions. Specifically, Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content in our packaging to 50% by 2020. Our updated goal has been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative.

While these commitments are more recent, we started collecting and analyzing energy use data in 1998 and completed our first carbon emissions inventory in 2002. We have reported publicly on our efforts to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) since 2004 and we were recognized as a member of the Carbon Disclosure Leadership Index in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2013, 2015 and we were on the Climate A List in 2016 and 2017. Colgate-Palmolive was named a US EPA Energy Star Partner of the Year in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 for our commitment to energy efficiency on a company-wide basis. We have reduced our energy intensity by over 30% since 2002.

We have continued to expand our understanding and processes related to Greenhouse Gas (GHG) data collection and reporting and are continuing to expand the boundaries of our Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions reporting. We continue to find opportunities beyond our own facilities to have impact on GHG emissions, in particular those related to the water and GHGs associated with the use of our products. Colgate's "Save Water" campaign has had global reach and impact on consumers behaviors as they increasingly "turn off the tap" while using many of our products. These behavior changes are having substantial impacts to our value chain carbon footprint, of which consumer use accounts for approximately 90%.

We will also continue to drive improvement in our Sustainability 2020 targets:
- Promote use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% compared to 2002
- Reduce our manufacturing energy intensity by one-third compared to 2002
- Partner with key suppliers, customers, and consumers to reduce energy, greenhouse gas emissions and waste

C0.2

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Row 1	January 1 2018	December 31 2018	No	<Not Applicable>

C0.3

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

Argentina
Australia
Belgium
Brazil
Cameroon
China
Colombia
Czechia
Fiji
France
Greece
Guatemala
India
Italy
Malaysia
Mexico
Morocco
Myanmar
Netherlands
Pakistan
Papua New Guinea
Poland
Saudi Arabia
South Africa
Switzerland
Thailand
Turkey
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Viet Nam

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 consolidation approach to your Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas inventory.

Financial control

C1. Governance

C1.1

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

Yes

C1.1a

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

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board Chair	Sustainability is integrated at the core of Colgate's overall strategy, including our brand strategy and brand purpose. Since the Board has the final decision on overall strategy, Colgate's Executive Chairman, President and CEO and full Board of Directors are kept abreast of the Company's progress via regular updates and consider sustainability matters, risks and opportunities in decision-making, including those related to our climate strategy. Sustainability and climatic risk are considered an emerging risk as part of our Enterprise Risk Management planning; as part of that process, the Board is briefed on key sustainability issues. The Personnel and Organization Committee of the Board reviews the Company's sustainability and social responsibility programs and other public interest matters, including cultural diversity, equal opportunity, charitable giving, and international human rights.
Other, please specify (Board)	Colgate's full Board of Directors, which includes Colgate's Executive Chairman and President and CEO, is kept abreast of the Company's progress via regular updates and consider sustainability matters, risks and opportunities in decision-making, including those related to our climate strategy. Sustainability and climatic risk are considered an emerging risk as part of our Enterprise Risk Management planning; as part of that process, the Board is briefed on key sustainability issues. The Personnel and Organization Committee of the Board reviews the Company's sustainability and social responsibility programs and other public interest matters, including cultural diversity, equal opportunity, charitable giving, and international human rights.
Board-level committee	The Personnel and Organization Committee of the Board reviews the Company's sustainability and social responsibility programs and other public interest matters, including cultural diversity, equal opportunity, charitable giving, and international human rights.
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Colgate's President and CEO and full Board of Directors are kept abreast of the Company's progress via regular updates and consider sustainability matters, risks and opportunities in decision-making, including those related to our climate strategy. Sustainability and climatic risk are considered an emerging risk as part of our Enterprise Risk Management planning; as part of that process, the Board is briefed on key sustainability issues. The Personnel and Organization Committee of the Board reviews the Company's sustainability and social responsibility programs and other public interest matters, including cultural diversity, equal opportunity, charitable giving, and international human rights.

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Please explain
Scheduled – all meetings	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 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	Sustainability related issues are discussed in quarterly board meetings, which may or may not include issues that are directly or indirectly related to climate change. Climate related risks and opportunities are included as appropriate during reviews with the board. This may include progress updates on climate and energy goals, supply chain programs such as energy efficiency, renewable energy and progress against science-based climate targets. Also included are relevant NGO and regulatory activities.

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
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Quarterly
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify (President, North America Division & Global Sustainability)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Quarterly
Sustainability committee	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Not reported to the board
Other, please specify (VP Glb Sustainability, EOHS & SC Stratgy)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Half-yearly
Risk committee	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	Not reported to the board
Facility manager	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Not reported to the board
Other, please specify (SVP, Investor Relations)	Other, please specify (Reviewing external messaging)	As important matters arise

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).

Colgate's Executive Chairman, President and CEO , and full Board of Directors are kept informed of the Company's progress via regular updates and consider sustainability matters, risks, and opportunities in decision-making. Sustainability is considered an emerging risk as part of our Enterprise Risk Management process. Additionally, Colgate's Chief Financial Officer provides the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors with an update on the Company's Enterprise Management Program. The Personnel and Organization Committee of the Board reviews the Company's sustainability and social responsibility programs and other public interest matters, including cultural diversity, equal opportunity, charitable giving, and international human rights.

A Sustainability Steering Committee composed of Colgate's President, North America Division & Global Sustainability, who leads our sustainability efforts; SVP, Chief of Staff; Vice President, Global Sustainability, EHS and Supply Chain Strategy; Chief Technology Officer; Chief Human Resources Officer; Chief Legal Officer; Vice President, Global Compensation and Benefits; Chief Marketing Officer; and Chief Supply Chain Officer makes strategic decisions related to sustainability and guides the organization to meet sustainability goals. Colgate's Vice President, Global Sustainability, EHS, and Supply Chain Strategy has direct responsibility for implementing sustainability and EHS programs. For our annual corporate social responsibility report, the Global Sustainability team gathers the content cross-functionally and the Sustainability Steering Committee reviews the final report content.

Additionally, networks of senior leaders in each division and local champions support on-the-ground sustainability efforts, communications, and reporting. Global functions such as Human Resources, Packaging, Procurement, and Technology coordinate certain aspects of the program where global consistency is appropriate. Moreover, to integrate sustainability tracking and disclosures into our business strategy, operations, and employee review process, Colgate's global sustainability initiatives have been added to team goals and individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's senior managers.

VP, Global Sustainability, EOHS and Supply Chain Strategy, has responsibility for climate change on a day-to-day basis. Together with Colgate's Director of Environmental Sustainability, Global Supply Chain, she has global responsibility for climate change matters on a day-to-day basis. The Global Sustainability and EOHS team includes dedicated, full-time resources to execute our energy and climate change strategies. The team is responsible for engaging with Colgate teams around the world to initiate projects that save energy and reduce carbon emissions. On a local basis, site management is responsible for the site's performance against climate change goals. Local leaders are empowered to make operational decisions to meet or exceed their goals. Colgate also has a network of Division Sustainability Leaders - a senior representative from each geographic Division within Colgate, as well as from Hill's Pet Nutrition and Tom's of Maine. The leaders facilitate the implementation of the 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy within each Division, communicate to Colgate people about the strategy, and report back on progress to Corporate Sustainability teams. They report directly to Division Presidents and have sustainability goals as part of their individual objectives and title.

Colgate's President, North America Division & Global Sustainability, who reports to Colgate'sPresident and CEO, is also responsible for global sustainability, including meeting our climate change targets.

C1.3

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

Yes

C1.3a

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

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?

The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Emissions reduction target

Monetary reward

Corporate executive team

Types of incentives

The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Emissions reduction target

Monetary reward

Activity incentivized

The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Emissions reduction target

Comment

The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?

The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's facility managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Energy reduction project
Monetary reward
Facilities manager

Types of incentives
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's facility managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction project
Monetary reward

Activity incentivized
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's facility managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction project

Comment
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's facility managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?
Recognition for climate change issues may occur through The Chairman's "You Can Make a Difference Award" Program. Introduced in 1986, the program was created to reward Colgate people all over the world and at all levels who exhibit innovation, ingenuity and performance excellence. Many winning teams have made process changes to reduce energy, water and waste, or make other sustainability improvements.
Other, please specify (Behaviour change related indicator)
Recognition (non-monetary)
All employees

Types of incentives
Recognition for climate change issues may occur through The Chairman's "You Can Make a Difference Award" Program. Introduced in 1986, the program was created to reward Colgate people all over the world and at all levels who exhibit innovation, ingenuity and performance excellence. Many winning teams have made process changes to reduce energy, water and waste, or make other sustainability improvements.
Other, please specify (Behaviour change related indicator)
Recognition (non-monetary)

Activity incentivized
Recognition for climate change issues may occur through The Chairman's "You Can Make a Difference Award" Program. Introduced in 1986, the program was created to reward Colgate people all over the world and at all levels who exhibit innovation, ingenuity and performance excellence. Many winning teams have made process changes to reduce energy, water and waste, or make other sustainability improvements.
Other, please specify (Behaviour change related indicator)

Comment
Recognition for climate change issues may occur through The Chairman's "You Can Make a Difference Award" Program. Introduced in 1986, the program was created to reward Colgate people all over the world and at all levels who exhibit innovation, ingenuity and performance excellence. Many winning teams have made process changes to reduce energy, water and waste, or make other sustainability improvements.

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including energy and climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's energy managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction project
Monetary reward
Energy manager

Types of incentives
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including energy and climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's energy managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction project
Monetary reward

Activity incentivized
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including energy and climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's energy managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction project

Comment
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including energy and climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's energy managers (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for the VP, Global Sustainability, EOHS and Supply Chain Strategy (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Emissions reduction target
Monetary reward
Environment/Sustainability manager

Types of incentives
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for the VP, Global Sustainability, EOHS and Supply Chain Strategy (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Emissions reduction target
Monetary reward

Activity incentivized
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for the VP, Global Sustainability, EOHS and Supply Chain Strategy (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Emissions reduction target

Comment
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for the VP, Global Sustainability, EOHS and Supply Chain Strategy (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction target
Monetary reward
Management group

Types of incentives
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction target
Monetary reward

Activity incentivized
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).
Energy reduction target

Comment
The achievement of Colgate's global sustainability initiatives and targets, including climate change-related targets, has been added to the individual objectives used to determine the compensation for many of Colgate's managers and directors (where individual performance is a component of their compensation).

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

(C2.1) Describe what your organization considers to be short-, medium- and long-term horizons.

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	1	3	
Medium-term	3	6	
Long-term	6	20	

C2.2

(C2.2) Select the option that best describes how your organization's processes for identifying, assessing, and managing climate-related issues are integrated into your overall risk management.
Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk identification, assessment, and management processes

C2.2a

(C2.2a) Select the options that best describe your organization's frequency and time horizon for identifying and assessing climate-related risks.

	Frequency of monitoring	How far into the future are risks considered?	Comment
Row 1	Six-monthly or more frequently	>6 years	The results are reported to the Board or individual/sub-set of the Board or committee appointed by the Board. Geographical areas considered: Global

C2.2b

(C2.2b) Provide further details on your organization's process(es) for identifying and assessing climate-related risks.

Identifying climate risks - company level: As part of its overall business risk assessment, Colgate monitors potential impacts related to brand reputation, operational disruption, supply availability and cost, customer/consumer awareness and NGO/regulatory activity. This is primarily done at the corporate level via the Sustainability Team, engaging with both external and internal stakeholders to understand both the level of importance and potential impacts.

Identifying climate risks - asset level: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, prioritize and manage risks. Risks are collectively identified across the organization and are classified within the Strategic, Financial, Operational, IT, Legal & Compliance and Emerging Risk Categories. Each Risk Category is assigned to a member of Colgate's ERM Committee, who is ultimately accountable for managing the identified risk. We have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics "Plan B", Business Readiness Planning and Property Loss Control Programs that contemplate asset and resulting revenue protection through site design and improvements. Opportunities are identified through engagement with senior leadership, Global Energy Team and external stakeholders. For each opportunity a plan is put in place to reduce our footprint, deliver savings and our support our brands.

Assessing risks - asset level: In addition to the ERM process, Colgate: a) Monitors and reports climate related regulatory risks/opportunities b) Annually audits strategic sites against risk management criteria c) Conducts EHS audits at manufacturing sites, technology centers and warehouses every 3 – 5 years. d) Assesses climate change-related risks on agricultural raw materials as part of Procurement Risk Management Strategy. e) Tests Business Readiness Plans annually to ensure business continuity. f) Includes the impacts of climatic events in site selection and building design guidelines.

Steps of determining the relative significance of climate-related risks: 1) Assessing potential climate vulnerabilities to ensure our business is able to recover from climatic events. 2) Our Property Loss Control Program requires our strategic manufacturing sites be highly protected against risk. Category contingency sourcing plans have been developed and executed. 3) Conducting contingency planning for anticipated climatic events to ensure continuity of operations. 4) Setting a science-based target (SBT) to reduce our absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% by 2020. Minimum 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is allocated for energy reduction projects. 5) Use of renewable energy 6) Assessing GHGs in our value chain. 7) Using scientifically approved scenarios for the determination of our Science Based Targets and engaged with a team of students from the MIT Sloan School of Management to better understand steps of conducting a business oriented climate related scenario analysis.

The definitions of risk terminologies used: Our Enterprise Risk Management process establishes a common framework for our risk definition. This common framework is important for our engagement through a cross-functional Committee in our analysis of all identified risks. Colgate employs three metrics when examining risk: 1) The frequency or likelihood of the risk occurring; 2) the severity or financial impact to the Company should the risk materialize; 3) the adequacy of mitigation efforts employed against the risk. These three metrics are further defined on a scale of one to four, from the least severe and to the most significant respectively. Risks are then voted onto a color-coded four-quadrant Risk Map using these metrics. Those risks which are voted into the upper right quadrant are referred to as "Red Zone" risks. While each identified risk is assigned a Risk Owner and mitigation strategies for all risks are developed cross-functionally, those risks residing in the Red Zone are prioritized for continuous monitoring and mitigation.

Definition of substantive financial/strategic impact: Our company evaluates matters on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business. As a U.S. public company, we always have in mind, pursuant to U.S. federal securities laws, the materiality standard and what information would be be considered "material" to a reasonable investor, which does not have absolute dollar value or percentage thresholds. When evaluating particular matters, we would consider, among other factors, the size of the business units impacted; the size of the impact on those business units; whether the impact to the Company's business is continuing and whether the Company is able to offset such impact and the potential for shareholder or reputational impact.

C2.2c

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

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	Colgate's EOHS Policy states that we will comply with or exceed applicable environmental, health and safety regulations, which includes regulations associated with climate. (i) An example of the risk type: Many countries have introduced Emission Trading Schemes in the form of cap and trade or others to constrain actions that contribute to the adverse effects of climate change. For example, the European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. Over time we might expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe, such as India and China, may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Climate change is among the risks factors discussed in our 2018 10-K. Colgate publicly states that new or additional legal or regulatory requirements regarding climate change could result in adverse publicity and adversely affect our business and reputation. Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the President and CEO of the Company. Climate change is considered throughout the ERM process as a risk factor, which also includes regulatory risks related to climate change. As part of our efforts to mitigate climate change-related regulatory risks, in 2011, Colgate implemented a program to set an annual capital expenditure budget as a way to drive investment in environmental sustainability projects across our global manufacturing sites. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of five percent of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill.
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	As part of Colgate's efforts to track and monitor regulations, we seek to identify emerging regulations which may be applicable to the company. (i) Examples of these types of emerging regulations could include emissions trading schemes, which many countries have introduced in the form of cap and trade or others to constrain actions that contribute to the adverse effects of climate change. For example, the European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. Over time we expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe, such as India and China, may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Climate change is among the risks factors discussed in our 2018 10-K. Colgate publicly states that new or additional legal or regulatory requirements regarding climate change could result in adverse publicity and adversely affect our business and reputation. Additionally, as a separate process, Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the President and CEO of the Company. Climate change is considered throughout the ERM process as a risk factor, which also includes regulatory risks related to climate change. As part of our efforts to mitigate climate change-related regulatory risks, in 2011, Colgate implemented a program to set an annual capital expenditure budget as a way to drive investment in environmental sustainability projects across our global manufacturing sites. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of five percent of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill.
Technology	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) An example of the risk type: Full Value Chain Climate Risk. Before doing a full value chain carbon footprint we did not completely understand where our risks and opportunities were to address and mitigate potential climate impacts. Our approach was to work to convert all value chain activities - from sourcing to logistics to manufacturing to consumer use to end of life - into measurable CO2e. For raw/packaging materials we evaluated the type, source and quantity of materials procured, then used LCA factors to convert those to CO2e. We estimated our logistics CO2e by utilizing our logistics routes and modeling tools for finished goods delivered to customers. For consumer use, we evaluated the volumes/types of products sold in various markets combined with consumer insight data on how people use those products (e.g. with or without hot water, etc.) to estimated CO2e impacts. Finally, we utilized global waste management data on how our products, packaging and wastewater are treated for end of life to estimate CO2e. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: As part of our work to develop product category specific carbon footprints, we identified high-carbon materials which have the largest impact on the products overall footprint. We then worked with our procurement team to investigate alternative suppliers and/or materials where possible. This information was also shared with our Technology organization for better understanding of the impacts of material selection in the formulation process.
Legal	Relevant, always included	(i) An example of the risk type: Colgate's EOHS Policy states that we will comply with or exceed applicable environmental, health and safety regulations, which includes regulations associated with climate. Our 2018 10-K states that “Concern over climate change may result in new or additional legal and regulatory requirements to reduce or mitigate the effects of climate change on the environment. Despite our sustainability efforts, any failure to achieve our sustainability goals to reduce our impact on the environment or the perception (whether or not valid) that we have failed to act responsibly with respect to the environment or to effectively respond to new or additional legal or regulatory requirements regarding climate change could result in adverse publicity and adversely affect our business and reputation.” (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Climate change is considered throughout the ERM process as a risk factor, which also includes legal risks related to climate change. We monitor the existing and emerging regulations on carbon emissions that might be applicable to the company, such as EU Emission Trading Scheme. In 2017 we did not need to participate in the European EU Emissions Trading Scheme due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects.
Market	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) An example of the risk type: Consumers are increasingly purchasing products that meet their needs and have a reduced environmental & social footprint. They want to buy products from brands that they trust and expect transparency about their environmental impact. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Colgate takes the change in consumer preferences into account in understanding how climate-change related topics can impact its market growth and continue to innovate to meet the needs of evolving consumer trends. Colgate has engaged certain trade partners and customers in opportunities to reduce GHG emissions associated with the use of our products. More specifically, our "Save Water" campaign has been rolled out to key customers as a way to change consumer habits on water use, which then translates into reductions in GHGs. We have included this major campaign and GHG reduction results in Walmart's Project Gigaton under Product Use.
Reputation	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) An example of the risk type: Consumers, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and other external organizations expect companies to do their part in the fight against climate change. CDP, representing more than 820 institutional investors, requests our disclosure of climate change strategy and energy and greenhouse gas emissions data each year. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Where applicable, Colgate integrates climate-related aspects of the Company's brands and reputation. As an example, our "Save Water" campaign has been rolled out to key customers as a way to change consumer habits on water use, which then translates into reductions in GHGs. We have included this major campaign and GHG reduction results in Walmart's Project Gigaton under Product Use.
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	(i) An example of the risk type: Predominant acute physical risks related to climate for Colgate include: operational disruption (to our facilities, suppliers, utilities, logistics and customers) from events such as severe storms, flooding, and droughts /water scarcity. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: We include acute physical risks such as disruptions due to water, energy, floods, droughts, and sea level rise in our site contingency and recovery planning and global risk management processes. Resiliency investments are made in accordance with our Loss Prevention and 3rd party engineering and insurance assessments to address learnings from acute events.
Chronic physical	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) An example of the risk type: Changes in weather patterns and warming of the climate have the potential to impact the cost and availability of agricultural commodities. As an example, the 2016 El Nino resulted in severe drought in South East Asia impacting supply and increased cost of coconut oil, palm oil and palm kernel oil prices. In Brazil, drought can affect herd sizes, limiting the material availability in low risks and triggering the high cost of tallow material. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Colgate has a formal process to identify critical and high risk suppliers (e.g. high volume suppliers, suppliers of critical materials, non-substitutable formulas). Our segmentation and global strategic plan help us to classify materials and suppliers according to the criticality of the material segment as well as the market complexity and buyer power using a segmentation and risk assessment matrix tool. For example, as part of our risk management method, selected agricultural materials that are impacted by change in precipitation extremes and droughts are considered in this process (e.g. corn, tropical oils, tallow). Risk management plans including changes in source of supply and potential alternative formulations are in place to mitigate sourcing risks.
Upstream	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) An example of the risk type: Risks include climate change related supply disruption of commodity raw materials and water. Predominant acute physical risks related to climate for Colgate include: operational disruption (to our facilities, suppliers, utilities, logistics and customers) from events such as severe storms, flooding, and droughts /water scarcity. Supply disruption is also among the risks that assess in our upstream. We have conducted water scarcity screening assessments on a limited scale for suppliers using the Aqueduct tool. Responses to this risk type are covered in our supplier contingency process and ERM process. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: Climate risks associated with material supplies are considered in the context of potential disruptions to supply from severe weather events, changes in growing conditions, and cost. To calculate and consider those risks we analyze the following sources of information and analytics: Supplier market intelligence reports, including the reports from our key strategic commodity traders, The NOAA weather global report and the Bloomberg Terminal, which is used by our Global Procurement Commodity team. We use this and other elements to build contingency planning, drive procurement decisions and support our Hurricane Season inventory management and planning.
Downstream	Relevant, sometimes included	(i) An example of the risk type: Climate risks associated with downstream consumer use of our products are considered in the context of potential disruptions to water supplies needed for consumers to use our products. In addition, market and reputational risks are also part of our downstream risks due to the reasons described above, such as a change in consumer preferences and NGO focus on climate change-related issues. Our commitment to using sustainable palm oil and paper-based materials is helping us to engage with key stakeholders to increase the awareness of certified materials in some specific regions. For example, we are part of the Sustainable Palm Oil Coalition for India, and we are engaging with WWF, RSPO and Rainforest Alliance to promote in the region the usage of sustainable palm oil. We are doing the same, working with WWF India promoting the usage of certified paper-based materials. Our "Save Water" campaign strives to raise awareness and change consumer behaviors related to saving water. (ii) Inclusion of climate-related risk in our risk assessment process: These types of exposures are included in our ERM-sponsored climate-related risk assessments. Our Consumer Innovation Centers located in six geographies around the world are the pulse of our product pipeline. We engage directly with consumers to understand their product preferences and we build new product ideas with on the ground R&D teams. The Company’s Social Listening team employs a “follow-the-sun” 24/7 monitoring process of consumers’ social media posts related to our products. Here we further understand consumers’ preferences as well as their dislikes specifically related to product sourcing, raw material selections, product formulation and packaging decisions.

C2.2d

(C2.2d) Describe your process(es) for managing climate-related risks and opportunities.

Company Level Risks/Opportunity Management:

Colgate has a well-established Enterprise Risk Management Program and an Enterprise Risk Management Committee. The Enterprise Risk Management Committee consists of sixteen senior executives, led by the Company's President & CEO, Noel Wallace. The Committee meets quarterly to identify, assess, prioritize and mitigate the risks that could negatively impact achievement of the Company's strategic and operating objectives, which also includes climate change related risks.

The Committee has identified both internal (operational, financial, legal & compliance, IT, and strategic) and external (climatic, economic/geopolitical, industry/competition) sources of risk. Identified risks are prioritized using a Risk Map, which weighs severity, probability and the strength current mitigation efforts. Each of the most critical or "Red Zone" risks identified is assigned to a corporate officer to manage, test and present routinely to the senior leadership team and, at least annually, to Colgate's Board of Directors. Accountability is a key differentiator of the ERM Program.

Simultaneously, climate change-related opportunities are reviewed by several teams including Global Sustainability, Supply Chain, Global Marketing and Engineering, focusing on four main areas aligned with our growth strategy: strengthening core business, capturing change in consumer demands, exploring new business models and reaching new markets and channels. Climate change-related innovations in products, production and supply chain are considered throughout the development of strategies regarding these four growth components.

Asset Level Risks/Opportunity Management:

We have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics "Plan B," Business Readiness Planning and Property Loss Control Programs that contemplate asset and resulting revenue protection through site design and improvements.

We produce comprehensive scenarios on market/business environment risks and natural disasters. Our Environmental, Occupational Health & Safety (EOHS) Audit teams conduct stress tests at our manufacturing and technology sites every 3-5 years. Natural disaster risks are considered when deciding the location of our strategic manufacturing sites. External guidance is also provided by climate and structural consultants. Our Property Loss Control Committee (PLC) is tasked with auditing strategic site compliance with Property Loss Control standards, also covering climate-related issues such as flood elevation and windstorm exposure, focusing on anchoring, bracing, connections and other industry metrics.

For each risk identified a plan is put in place that includes process definition, communication plan requirements, ongoing measurement/monitoring as well as, improvement plans and training to enhance risk mitigation. Opportunities at the company and asset level are identified and prioritized through engagement with senior leadership, our Global Energy Team and external stakeholders such as USEPA Energy Star, USGBC, World Resources Institute, U.S. Green Building Council, CDP, and the Environmental Defense Fund. For each opportunity a plan is put in place to reduce our footprint, deliver savings and support our brands.

Physical risk management:

Situation: Climate change is putting pressure on the availability of fresh water, an important resource for the production and use of our products.

Task: We have to increase water efficiency and reduce consumption.

Action: In 2018 Colgate invested ~$33M in planet projects, some of which was allocated for water efficiency in manufacturing. We also invested in educating the public about water conservation. We partnered with MIT to develop a net zero water strategy to replenish water removed from highly stressed regions of operation. We continue our partnership with Michael Phelps, as the global ambassador for our Save Water campaign.

Result: 45.8% reduction in manufacturing water intensity against since 2002 levels and Save Water Campaign reached ~4B people in 70+ countries.

Transitional risk management:

Situation: European EU Emissions Trading Scheme can pose financial risk if it applies to Colgate.

Task: To avoid the trading scheme with higher energy efficiency.

Action: We invested at least 5% of our capital budget to planet projects some of which include energy reduction projects. Since inception in 2011, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, which have delivered an estimated savings of more than $59 million.

Result: In 2018, we did not need to participate in the EU ETS Scheme due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. If we needed to participate, the potential financial impact would have been estimated to be (avg.) from $120,000 to $210,000/year from 2018 onwards.

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
Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term
The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. We expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes in the future. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time.
Increased operating costs (e.g., higher compliance costs, increased insurance premiums)
Policy and legal: Increased pricing of GHG emissions
Transition risk
Direct operations
Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?
Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term
The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. We expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes in the future. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time.
Increased operating costs (e.g., higher compliance costs, increased insurance premiums)
Policy and legal: Increased pricing of GHG emissions
Transition risk
Direct operations

Risk type

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term
The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. We expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes in the future. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time.
Increased operating costs (e.g., higher compliance costs, increased insurance premiums)
Policy and legal: Increased pricing of GHG emissions
Transition risk

Primary climate-related risk driver

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term
The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. We expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes in the future. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time.
Increased operating costs (e.g., higher compliance costs, increased insurance premiums)
Policy and legal: Increased pricing of GHG emissions

Type of financial impact

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.

Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term
The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. We expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes in the future. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time.
Increased operating costs (e.g., higher compliance costs, increased insurance premiums)

Company- specific description

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term
The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. We expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes in the future. This has the potential to increase operating costs over time.

Time horizon

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely
Medium-term

Likelihood

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000

i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all

manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000
120000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).
210000

Explanation of financial impact figure

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.
Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would have been (avg.) from $120K to $210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about $7/ton (current) to about $11/ton (max. est.).

Management method

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both

environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000
i) Management Method: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in “planet” related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction). ii) Example: In 2018, Colgate allocated $33 million to its planet projects and over $8 million of this amount was invested to energy related projects. The rest was allocated to water and waste related projects which also help reduce GHG emissions onsite. We also conduct an “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations, as well as Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. In 2018, Energy Treasure Hunts were completed at Colgate facilities in the United States, Italy, Mexico, and France. Our facility in Anzio, Italy, completed its second Energy Treasure Hunt in 2018. They identified 37 energy reduction opportunities, with over one-third estimated to have no more than a one-year payback. While our actions may not reduce the likelihood of regulation, they can reduce the magnitude of the impact for Colgate sites. iii) Management Cost and Calculation: In order to identify the total amount of investments that have climate change mitigation aspect, we calculated the summation of all the investments with an energy, waste or water tag which was $33+ million. Energy Hunt programs not included.

Cost of management

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.
33000000

Comment

Our 5% for the Planet program sets a global goal to spend 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation and reduction of waste to landfill. Our “5% for the Planet” program helps ensure that sites identify, fund and implement climate, energy, water, and waste projects that drive both environmental improvement and cost savings. The program sets an annual goal to invest a minimum of 5% of our manufacturing capital expenditure budget on energy reduction, water conservation, and reduction of waste to landfill. A minimum of 2% of the manufacturing capital budget is targeted specifically toward energy reduction projects. Since inception, Colgate has invested more than $235 million in more than 1,250 planet projects, delivering an estimated savings of more than $59 million.

Identifier

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term
Hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. Operational costs were nominal, in one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000.
Reduced revenue from decreased production capacity (e.g., transport difficulties, supply chain interruptions)
Acute: Increased severity of extreme weather events such as cyclones and floods
Physical risk
Supply chain
Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past

<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term
Hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. Operational costs were nominal, in one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000.
Reduced revenue from decreased production capacity (e.g., transport difficulties, supply chain interruptions)
Acute: Increased severity of extreme weather events such as cyclones and floods
Physical risk
Supply chain

Risk type

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term
Hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. Operational costs were nominal, in one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000.
Reduced revenue from decreased production capacity (e.g., transport difficulties, supply chain interruptions)
Acute: Increased severity of extreme weather events such as cyclones and floods
Physical risk

Primary climate-related risk driver

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term
Hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. Operational costs were nominal, in one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000.
Reduced revenue from decreased production capacity (e.g., transport difficulties, supply chain interruptions)
Acute: Increased severity of extreme weather events such as cyclones and floods

Type of financial impact

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term
Hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. Operational costs were nominal, in one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000.
Reduced revenue from decreased production capacity (e.g., transport difficulties, supply chain interruptions)

Company- specific description

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term
Hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. Operational costs were nominal, in one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000.

Time horizon

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate

Medium-low
Very likely
Short-term

Likelihood

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely

Magnitude of impact

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored

by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
300000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.
In the past, there have been disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico due to climatic events. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales as a result of these events, which are listed in the company-specific description. In one case lost sales is estimated at $300,000, which can provide insights as to the potential impacts of these events. We calculate our estimated financial impact based on these costs in the past

Management method

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000
i) Management: Colgate uses an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical risks. The ERM Committee is sponsored

by the Chairman, President and CEO of the Company and includes representation from key business leaders. Risks associated with tropical cyclones are defined as Natural Disasters and reside within the Operational Risk Category. Natural Disaster mitigation efforts are addressed specifically within the Operations Risk Management Committee, a subcommittee of our ERM program. ii)Ex: Specific to tropical cyclones, we implement the Hurricane Contingency Sourcing Plan annually for feedstock sourced from the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico, which entails an inventory build of feedstock prior to the annual hurricane season to minimize risk associated with supply disruption (implemented in 2018 as well). ii) Cost: There are limited costs associated with planning activities such as Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Business Readiness Plans and Logistics “Plan B”. For example, we have hurricane contingency plans in the Gulf of Mexico and in Mexico, where we have experienced disruption of key materials from Hurricanes Katrina and Patricia. One of the most significant on-going cost is associated with the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Contingency Plan. Each year working capital is increased by 1% for a three-month period and approximately $500,000 in incremental operating cost is incurred for material pre-build and storage.

Cost of management

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.
500000

Comment

We define Natural Disasters as the physical risks associated with water and climate change that could disrupt our commercial and supply chain operations. For example, we have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental and Loss Prevention Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics “Plan B” and Business Readiness Planning.

Identifier

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term
As a consumer product company that uses forest-risk commodities such as Pulp and Paper, Palm Oil, Tallow and Soy, Colgate is exposed to reputational risks if they are not managed properly. Forest-risk commodities are linked to climate change through historical change in land use/deforestation of tropical forests. Therefore we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities due to the financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials. To increase transparency with our stakeholders and manage this risk, Colgate issued a No Deforestation Policy in March 2014 and reports progress toward our 2020 goals in our CDP Forests response and annual Sustainability Report.
Other, please specify (Increased cost of raw materials for certified products.)
Market: Increased cost of raw materials
Transition risk
Supply chain
Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000

8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term
As a consumer product company that uses forest-risk commodities such as Pulp and Paper, Palm Oil, Tallow and Soy, Colgate is exposed to reputational risks if they are not managed properly. Forest-risk commodities are linked to climate change through historical change in land use/deforestation of tropical forests. Therefore we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities due to the financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials. To increase transparency with our stakeholders and manage this risk, Colgate issued a No Deforestation Policy in March 2014 and reports progress toward our 2020 goals in our CDP Forests response and annual Sustainability Report.
Other, please specify (Increased cost of raw materials for certified products.)
Market: Increased cost of raw materials
Transition risk
Supply chain

Risk type

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the "Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome". Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term
As a consumer product company that uses forest-risk commodities such as Pulp and Paper, Palm Oil, Tallow and Soy, Colgate is exposed to reputational risks if they are not managed properly. Forest-risk commodities are linked to climate change through historical change in land use/deforestation of tropical forests. Therefore we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities due to the financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials. To increase transparency with our stakeholders and manage this risk, Colgate issued a No Deforestation Policy in March 2014 and reports progress toward our 2020 goals in our CDP Forests response and annual Sustainability Report.
Other, please specify (Increased cost of raw materials for certified products.)
Market: Increased cost of raw materials
Transition risk

Primary climate-related risk driver

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the "Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome". Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term
As a consumer product company that uses forest-risk commodities such as Pulp and Paper, Palm Oil, Tallow and Soy, Colgate is exposed to reputational risks if they are

not managed properly. Forest-risk commodities are linked to climate change through historical change in land use/deforestation of tropical forests. Therefore we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities due to the financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials. To increase transparency with our stakeholders and manage this risk, Colgate issued a No Deforestation Policy in March 2014 and reports progress toward our 2020 goals in our CDP Forests response and annual Sustainability Report.
Other, please specify (Increased cost of raw materials for certified products.)
Market: Increased cost of raw materials

Type of financial impact

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the "Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome". Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term
As a consumer product company that uses forest-risk commodities such as Pulp and Paper, Palm Oil, Tallow and Soy, Colgate is exposed to reputational risks if they are not managed properly. Forest-risk commodities are linked to climate change through historical change in land use/deforestation of tropical forests. Therefore we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities due to the financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials. To increase transparency with our stakeholders and manage this risk, Colgate issued a No Deforestation Policy in March 2014 and reports progress toward our 2020 goals in our CDP Forests response and annual Sustainability Report.
Other, please specify (Increased cost of raw materials for certified products.)

Company- specific description

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the "Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome". Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term
As a consumer product company that uses forest-risk commodities such as Pulp and Paper, Palm Oil, Tallow and Soy, Colgate is exposed to reputational risks if they are not managed properly. Forest-risk commodities are linked to climate change through historical change in land use/deforestation of tropical forests. Therefore we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities due to the financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials. To increase transparency with our stakeholders and manage this risk, Colgate issued a No Deforestation Policy in March 2014 and reports progress toward our 2020 goals in our CDP Forests response and annual Sustainability Report.

Time horizon

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000

We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not
Medium-term

Likelihood

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low
More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range
Low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected

to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers’ perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000
8000000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the “Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome”. Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require

certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.
9000000

Explanation of financial impact figure

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the "Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome". Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.
The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. But we can quantify the impact of this perception on our procurement costs, which is due to the effort of mitigating risks of negative perception. Cost to procure certified palm oil and palm kernel oil for 100% of our tier-1 volume is btw $8-9MM. The cost to procure certified palm oil, PKO and palm derivatives for 100% of our tier-1 and tier-2 volumes is around $34MM. We analyzed scenarios for removing palm oil and derivatives from our product formulas and found some challenges to find substitute feedstocks in some markets we operate. Also we learned that the palm oil productivity and yield is higher vs. other vegetable oils. We evaluated moving from palm and PKO oils to CNO and there was not enough feedstock to support our volumes. The cost impact for this was ~$63 million approximately.

Management method

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000
We established a Palm Oil Sourcing Team of procurement professionals to implement the palm oil sourcing commitments and to develop palm oil sourcing guidelines. We are engaging the broader sourcing teams globally which manage the suppliers of commodities to ensure understanding, communication, and execution of our commitments. Examples by commodity: Palm: We are partnering with EarthWorm (old TFT) to meet the traceability and responsible sourcing commitments outlined in our No Deforestation Policy for Palm Oil. Tallow: All applicable suppliers comply with the "Minimum Criteria for Industrial Scale Cattle Operations in the Brazilian Amazon Biome". Paper and Board: Colgate will take actions to optimize the use of wood fiber, recycled content and alternative fibers, perform risk assessments and require certification. Soy: Colgate has committed to procuring soy products that are not linked to deforestation, verifying via independent third parties and monitoring. Colgate is a member of RTRS, Cost Calculation: The cost of GreenPalm certificates and physical certified oils is market-driven and will increase the cost of palm oil and derivatives. 2015 cost to purchase Green Palm Certificates and Physical Certified Oil for Palm and PKO was in the range of $3-4 million. Previously, we invested $4.6 million in a tallow refining system at our soap plant in Brazil to increase our ability to source tallow from low-risk region suppliers, delivering $3M/yr in gross savings.

Cost of management

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.
8000000

Comment

For palm oil, we will continue to disclose our progress to RSPO, and will report twice per year on our progress against our commitments. For paper and board, we will perform risk assessments to assure low risk of controversial sources of fiber contributing to deforestation in the supply chain. Paper and Board forest certification will be required of all of our pulp and paper supply sources, and certification requirements will be included in specifications. The costs to procure certified pulp/paper are expected to be negligible, as market is relatively mature.

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

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.

33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term
Regulations that require reporting of emissions present a competitive opportunity for Colgate given our long-standing commitment to emissions reporting and reduction. We have been collecting and analyzing our manufacturing consumption data since 1998 and have long-standing emissions reduction programs in place. We have also begun capturing carbon emissions data associated with movement of our finished goods. These actions have also prepared us to minimize any costs associated with cap and trade schemes and fuel/energy taxes. Regulatory emissions reporting under EU ETS and voluntary emissions reporting to USEPA Energy Star and CDP have helped engage the organization and drive program development.
Reduced operating costs (e.g., through efficiency gains and cost reductions)
Use of more efficient production and distribution processes
Resource efficiency
Direct operations
Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?
We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term
Regulations that require reporting of emissions present a competitive opportunity for Colgate given our long-standing commitment to emissions reporting and reduction. We have been collecting and analyzing our manufacturing consumption data since 1998 and have long-standing emissions reduction programs in place. We have also begun capturing carbon emissions data associated with movement of our finished goods. These actions have also prepared us to minimize any costs associated with cap and trade schemes and fuel/energy taxes. Regulatory emissions reporting under EU ETS and voluntary emissions reporting to USEPA Energy Star and CDP have helped engage the organization and drive program development.
Reduced operating costs (e.g., through efficiency gains and cost reductions)
Use of more efficient production and distribution processes
Resource efficiency
Direct operations

Opportunity type
We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33

M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term
Regulations that require reporting of emissions present a competitive opportunity for Colgate given our long-standing commitment to emissions reporting and reduction. We have been collecting and analyzing our manufacturing consumption data since 1998 and have long-standing emissions reduction programs in place. We have also begun capturing carbon emissions data associated with movement of our finished goods. These actions have also prepared us to minimize any costs associated with cap and trade schemes and fuel/energy taxes. Regulatory emissions reporting under EU ETS and voluntary emissions reporting to USEPA Energy Star and CDP have helped engage the organization and drive program development.
Reduced operating costs (e.g., through efficiency gains and cost reductions)
Use of more efficient production and distribution processes
Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our "Energy Top 10" program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. "Planet" related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term
Regulations that require reporting of emissions present a competitive opportunity for Colgate given our long-standing commitment to emissions reporting and reduction. We have been collecting and analyzing our manufacturing consumption data since 1998 and have long-standing emissions reduction programs in place. We have also begun capturing carbon emissions data associated with movement of our finished goods. These actions have also prepared us to minimize any costs associated with cap and trade schemes and fuel/energy taxes. Regulatory emissions reporting under EU ETS and voluntary emissions reporting to USEPA Energy Star and CDP have helped engage the organization and drive program development.
Reduced operating costs (e.g., through efficiency gains and cost reductions)
Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Type of financial impact

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our "Energy Top 10" program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. "Planet" related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term
Regulations that require reporting of emissions present a competitive opportunity for Colgate given our long-standing commitment to emissions reporting and reduction. We

have been collecting and analyzing our manufacturing consumption data since 1998 and have long-standing emissions reduction programs in place. We have also begun capturing carbon emissions data associated with movement of our finished goods. These actions have also prepared us to minimize any costs associated with cap and trade schemes and fuel/energy taxes. Regulatory emissions reporting under EU ETS and voluntary emissions reporting to USEPA Energy Star and CDP have helped engage the organization and drive program development.
Reduced operating costs (e.g., through efficiency gains and cost reductions)

Company-specific description

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term
Regulations that require reporting of emissions present a competitive opportunity for Colgate given our long-standing commitment to emissions reporting and reduction. We have been collecting and analyzing our manufacturing consumption data since 1998 and have long-standing emissions reduction programs in place. We have also begun capturing carbon emissions data associated with movement of our finished goods. These actions have also prepared us to minimize any costs associated with cap and trade schemes and fuel/energy taxes. Regulatory emissions reporting under EU ETS and voluntary emissions reporting to USEPA Energy Star and CDP have helped engage the organization and drive program development.

Time horizon

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely
Short-term

Likelihood

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy

efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low
Very likely

Magnitude of impact

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our "Energy Top 10" program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. "Planet" related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our "Energy Top 10" program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. "Planet" related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our "Energy Top 10" program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. "Planet" related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year's energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
560000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.
The savings associated with emissions reporting and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. This number has been calculated by looking at our energy efficiency in 2002 (energy/ton) then applying this number to each subsequent year’s energy use and applicable unit costs to estimate how much we "would have spent" vs what we actually spent toward our production processes.

Strategy to realize opportunity

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000
Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 70% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 70% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry. In 2014, we announced a commitment to reduce carbon emissions on an absolute basis by 25% compared to 2002 (Scope 1 & Scope 2). We completed a third iteration of our “Energy Top 10” program across all manufacturing operations and are conducting Energy Treasure Hunts at our largest strategic sites. Select Colgate sites have solar, cogeneration and/or are participating in demand response programs. “Planet” related projects with large carbon emission reductions include: Replacement of three chillers with one steam absorber (Anzio, Italy; 1,260 MWh/yr reduction); installation of automatic lighting controls and lighting fixture improvements (Mission Hills, Mexico; 730 MWh/yr reduction); installation of various energy projects such as installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps, air cooling units and a condensate recovery pump (Sanand, India; 781 MWh/yr reduction); replacing two screw air compressors with one centrifugal compressor (Cambridge, Ohio; 1,323 MWh/yr reduction). Cost Calculation: Colgate has a 5% Capital Investment for the Planet program. In 2018, Colgate invested over $33 M in 145 projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies.

Cost to realize opportunity

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our

customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.
33000000

Comment

We would expect the level of planet investment, which was $33 million in 2018, to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million. In addition to the strategy to reduce our carbon footprint described above, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint.

Identifier

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the ‘Save Water’ message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate’s significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate’s investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity’s endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate’s largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate’s consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current
Colgate has set a goal to reach all global consumers with water conservation messaging by 2020. By changing consumer behavior during product use we have the opportunity to reduce both our water and carbon footprint. Consumer messaging will also help to enhance and grow our brands.
Other, please specify (Increased revenue and brand value)
Reduced water usage and consumption
Resource efficiency
Customer
Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the ‘Save Water’ message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate’s significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate’s investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity’s endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate’s largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate’s consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current
Colgate has set a goal to reach all global consumers with water conservation messaging by 2020. By changing consumer behavior during product use we have the opportunity to reduce both our water and carbon footprint. Consumer messaging will also help to enhance and grow our brands.
Other, please specify (Increased revenue and brand value)
Reduced water usage and consumption
Resource efficiency
Customer

Opportunity type

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the ‘Save Water’ message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate’s significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate’s investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity’s endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate’s largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.

Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current
Colgate has set a goal to reach all global consumers with water conservation messaging by 2020. By changing consumer behavior during product use we have the opportunity to reduce both our water and carbon footprint. Consumer messaging will also help to enhance and grow our brands.
Other, please specify (Increased revenue and brand value)
Reduced water usage and consumption
Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current
Colgate has set a goal to reach all global consumers with water conservation messaging by 2020. By changing consumer behavior during product use we have the opportunity to reduce both our water and carbon footprint. Consumer messaging will also help to enhance and grow our brands.
Other, please specify (Increased revenue and brand value)
Reduced water usage and consumption

Type of financial impact

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current
Colgate has set a goal to reach all global consumers with water conservation messaging by 2020. By changing consumer behavior during product use we have the opportunity to reduce both our water and carbon footprint. Consumer messaging will also help to enhance and grow our brands.
Other, please specify (Increased revenue and brand value)

Company-specific description

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest

retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate’s consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current
Colgate has set a goal to reach all global consumers with water conservation messaging by 2020. By changing consumer behavior during product use we have the opportunity to reduce both our water and carbon footprint. Consumer messaging will also help to enhance and grow our brands.

Time horizon

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging.
Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the ‘Save Water’ message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate’s significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate’s investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity’s endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate’s largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate’s consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely
Current

Likelihood

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging.
Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the ‘Save Water’ message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate’s significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate’s investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity’s endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate’s largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate’s consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high
Very likely

Magnitude of impact

187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging.
Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the ‘Save Water’ message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate’s significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate’s investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity’s endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate’s largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the “Save Water” messaging at certain of such retailer’s stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate’s consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000

Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
1150000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
187000

Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.
Colgate's consumer messaging program is intended to drive awareness of water conservation while enhancing equity and growing preference for the brand. The impact of this campaign varies by geography and scale/scope of execution, but an indicative estimate can be derived based on a recent execution. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with one of the biggest retailers to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in stores activating the campaign.

Strategy to realize opportunity
187000
Colgate subsidiaries engage with our consumers to save water in different ways (video and Facebook messaging, in-store [at store entrance, end aisle displays] and on our packaging). Colgate has the Save Water logo reminder on the back of the product package globally, with a link to our new website colgate.com/savewater. The site gives water-saving tips and reminders for toothbrushing, handwashing, dishwashing, and showering, and is available in ten languages. TV commercials have been aired in selected markets. In 2017 we ran media in 70+ countries and expanded the program in 2018 assets that go beyond TV advertising, continuing our water messaging. Colgate is working with The Nature Conservancy on a new initiative to raise awareness of water issues in the U.S. and encourage consumers to conserve water. Cost calculation: Since 2017, we have had a global celebrity brand ambassador on board to help promote the 'Save Water' message in mass advertising campaigns as well as PR across markets. This partnership reflects Colgate's significant investment in the Save Water campaign. Colgate's investment of approx. $1.7MM /yr includes the celebrity's endorsement fee and together with the costs to produce and disseminate the Save water campaign. Based on this estimate and the fact that Colgate's largest retailer in the U.S. represents 11% of net sales, we estimate that the annual cost to activate the "Save Water" messaging at certain of such retailer's stores was USD $187K in 2018.

Cost to realize opportunity
187000

Comment

Identifier
690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term
As part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. This exercise helped us identify and prioritize renewable energy opportunities at more than 20 facilities around the world. We are also developing and implementing several renewable energy activities, including installing onsite solar electricity and purchasing renewable energy from our electricity providers. These projects will help us facilitate the transition to low carbon technology, increase resiliency and avoid carbon tax schemes.
Other, please specify (Energy efficiency and renewable energy cost saving)
Participation in renewable energy programs and adoption of energy-efficiency measures
Resilience
Direct operations
Opp3

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?
690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the

estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term
As part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. This exercise helped us identify and prioritize renewable energy opportunities at more than 20 facilities around the world. We are also developing and implementing several renewable energy activities, including installing onsite solar electricity and purchasing renewable energy from our electricity providers. These projects will help us facilitate the transition to low carbon technology, increase resiliency and avoid carbon tax schemes.
Other, please specify (Energy efficiency and renewable energy cost saving)
Participation in renewable energy programs and adoption of energy-efficiency measures
Resilience
Direct operations

Opportunity type

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term
As part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. This exercise helped us identify and prioritize renewable energy opportunities at more than 20 facilities around the world. We are also developing and implementing several renewable energy activities, including installing onsite solar electricity and purchasing renewable energy from our electricity providers. These projects will help us facilitate the transition to low carbon technology, increase resiliency and avoid carbon tax schemes.
Other, please specify (Energy efficiency and renewable energy cost saving)
Participation in renewable energy programs and adoption of energy-efficiency measures
Resilience

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term
As part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently

developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. This exercise helped us identify and prioritize renewable energy opportunities at more than 20 facilities around the world. We are also developing and implementing several renewable energy activities, including installing onsite solar electricity and purchasing renewable energy from our electricity providers. These projects will help us facilitate the transition to low carbon technology, increase resiliency and avoid carbon tax schemes.
Other, please specify (Energy efficiency and renewable energy cost saving)
Participation in renewable energy programs and adoption of energy-efficiency measures

Type of financial impact

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term
As part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. This exercise helped us identify and prioritize renewable energy opportunities at more than 20 facilities around the world. We are also developing and implementing several renewable energy activities, including installing onsite solar electricity and purchasing renewable energy from our electricity providers. These projects will help us facilitate the transition to low carbon technology, increase resiliency and avoid carbon tax schemes.
Other, please specify (Energy efficiency and renewable energy cost saving)

Company-specific description

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term
As part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. This exercise helped us identify and prioritize renewable energy opportunities at more than 20 facilities around the world. We are also developing and implementing several renewable energy activities, including installing onsite solar electricity and purchasing renewable energy from our electricity providers. These projects will help us facilitate the transition to low carbon technology, increase resiliency and avoid carbon tax schemes.

Time horizon

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment

continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely
Medium-term

Likelihood

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low
Very likely

Magnitude of impact

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate
Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled

projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>
100000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.
Some key impacts include meeting our SBT commitments, increased site resiliency due to less dependence on grid energy via on-site renewables, increased engagement potential with consumers around use of renewables to make our products. The investment in renewable energy often requires financial paybacks beyond typical savings projects, however with the advancement in technologies, combined with higher electricity rates and improved government financial incentives, the return on investment continues to improve over time. We working to estimate the overall financial benefits of using renewable energy in our value chain. However, to provide an example, the estimated savings from solar power-related projects approved in 2018 was calculated to be $100,000 / yr. This number would be much higher when projects on the roadmap are completed.

Strategy to realize opportunity
690000
Traditionally, Colgate has limited our renewable energy engagement mostly to purchasing green power, but more recently is increasing our direct investment in renewable energy and pursuing power purchase agreements. Colgate has been a U.S. EPA Green Power Partner since 2014, supporting the voluntary use of green power to reduce the environmental effects associated with conventional electricity use. In 2017, Colgate purchased Green-e certified wind power renewable energy certificates generated from wind power farms located in Kansas. This green power purchase was recognized by the U.S. EPA Green Power Partnership Leadership Club. The purchase of green power is allocated back to our facilities in proportion to their carbon emissions as a way to help assign a cost-of-carbon to its source. Cost calculation: Our energy efficiency and renewable energy roadmap has many components. However, to scale the cost with the potential benefits provided above we used the renewable energy labeled projects approved in 2018 and the total cost of these projects is estimated to be $690,000.

Cost to realize opportunity
690000

Comment

C2.5

(C2.5) Describe where and how the identified risks and opportunities have impacted your business.

	Impact	Description
Products and services	Not yet impacted	a) Description of Potential Risk Impact: As described in 2.3a, consumers are increasingly choosing products that have lower climate impacts and better for the environment. In accordance with our No Deforestation policy, we have identified potential reputational risks associated with climate aspects of deforestation.. b) Potential/Predicted Timescale of Impact: We identified the impacts to be low, however, we have not yet realized any reputational impacts that can affect our sales, which might occur over the next 5 years.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Impacted for some suppliers, facilities, or product lines	a) Description of Risk Impact: As described in 2.3a, hurricanes, typhoons and other natural disasters have the potential to damage/disrupt material supply, facility operations and logistics networks. Specific to hurricanes (e.g. Katrina), there have been historical disruptions in petroleum-derived materials sourced from the Gulf of Mexico. In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. b) Magnitude of Impact: One-time costs associated with Hurricane Katrina were~ $1.0 million, which also included costs related to supply chain and operations. However, operational costs related to other events have often been nominal.
Adaptation and mitigation activities	Impacted for some suppliers, facilities, or product lines	a) Description of Opportunity: As described in 2.4a, as part of our strategy to achieve a 25 percent absolute reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020 and to increase operational resiliency, we are working to promote the use of renewable energy and support development of a low-carbon energy supply. As a way to further develop our balanced approach to renewable energy, in 2018, Colgate began implementing prioritized renewable energy opportunities that were identified by Schneider Electric in their 2017 Colgate Renewable Energy Roadmap. Specifically, Colgate implemented a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Sri City, Indian and a 1 MWh solar power generation system in Burlington, NJ, USA. We are currently developing and implementing additional renewable energy activities identified in this Roadmap. b) The cost to implement the solar projects at Burlington & Sri City ranges between $750,000 and $925,000. The magnitude of this impact in terms of investment is likely between $5MM-$15MM depending upon technologies and location chosen to implement, as well as pricing and availability of financial subsidies. The estimated impact of this opportunity is medium.
Investment in R&D	Impacted for some suppliers, facilities, or product lines	a) Description of Risk Impact: As described in 2.3a, we have identified potential reputational risks associated with forest-risk commodities, associated with the negative perception of consumers on palm oil including products due to the risk of deforestation. If this risk is not managed properly, it may result in a decrease in demand for those products. The financial impacts associated with pressure groups impact on consumers' perception and purchase intent relating to our products containing these materials is not clearly quantifiable. b) Magnitude of Impact: Potential decrease in demand or sales due to shift in consumer preferences to products with certified or no palm-oil is very hard to quantify. However, the estimated impact is low. Additionally, the current cost to procure certified palm oils for 100% of our volumes is in the range of $8-9 million. Our R&D and Procurement organizations help design and manage product formulations to minimize both risk and costs. Please note, values disclosed under C2.4a are from a case study, values disclosed here provide insights as the RE roadmap we have devised.
Operations	Impacted	a) Description of Opportunity: As described in 2.3a and 2.4a, energy efficiency programs allowed Colgate to avoid ETS emissions cap and trade schemes and also reduce operational costs. b) Magnitude of Impact: The savings associated with emissions reduction and implementation of energy conservation projects across our manufacturing sites globally could be over $560 million in avoided costs in the coming years, based on our estimate of prior savings from the period of 2002 to 2018. The estimated impact of these savings is high. Additionally, through sustainable and efficient logistics projects around the globe and new and improved planning tools, we are reducing costs, better serving our customers and reducing our logistics carbon footprint. Also, Colgate has 100% achievement of LEED NC, 83% Supplier Response to CDP Supply Chain Project, 55% Suppliers with Energy Reduction Goals.), over 83% of sites achieve the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry and we are also committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in "planet" related projects annually.
Other, please specify	Please select	

C2.6

(C2.6) Describe where and how the identified risks and opportunities have been factored into your financial planning process.

	Relevance	Description
Revenues	Not yet impacted	a) Opportunity definition: Consumers expectations of CPG companies on sustainability issues like climate change (CC) are likely to increase favoring brands for addressing CC issues (Cherry et.al, 2018), potentially impacting revenues. According to a recent research (Feucht & Zander, 2018), more than 90% consumers in EU are willing to pay more for product with a climate-friendly claim. 80% of the consumers are either certain or would consider paying a 20% premium for products with a carbon impact label that states increased emission efficiency related to the product. In 2019, we conducted a sustainability prioritization assessment and workshops with our marketing team. Results reflect the belief that we can differentiate our brands through better communicating about our existing efforts to fight climate-change and by introducing products that reduce our consumer's climate-impact. b) Potential/Predicted Timescale of Impact: While we have not quantified the exact financial benefits of linking our brands with our effort to fight CC, we believe that such a focus may have a medium positive impact on demand and our revenues in the long run (>6 years). Supporting evidence is available through our Save Water Campaign. In the U.S. in 2018, a partnership with a retailer to encourage consumers to Save Water contributed to incremental net sales of approximately USD $1.15 million in those stores activating the Save Water campaign. c) Implementation: Colgate has already been engaging with several initiatives to leverage its climate-change related efforts through its brands and products. For example, In 2018, Colgate continued working with Walmart's Project Gigaton to support their goal to work with their suppliers to reduce 1 billion metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from the global value chain by 2030. Through Project Gigaton, Colgate has committed to GHG goals in six areas: emissions, energy, waste, deforestation, packaging, and product use. Colgate reports against these goals annually. Additionally we have been designing products that allow consumers to use less water or temperate water. Each year, Colgate works to assess the carbon consequences and opportunities across our value chain, including consumer use of products, and product end-of-life.
Operating costs	Not yet impacted	a) Risk Definition: Colgate reviewed potential changes in mean (average) temperature, temperature extremes, precipitation patterns, extremes and droughts and their potential to impact raw material pricing and increased demand for existing products or services. Colgate does not consider the physical impacts associated with climate change as a substantive opportunity. b) Magnitude: Impact: In 2018, Colgate invested $33M for capital upgrades and investments, which allowed us to improve our energy efficiency at the manufacturing sites and avoid carbon tax schemes. Thanks to Colgate's energy efficiency efforts, this risk has not materialized since Colgate has a well established "5% to Planet" investment initiative. Our efficiency efforts are designed to prevent an impact on operating costs on the short term (0-3 years). May the risk materialized, the impacts would be low. Thanks to these investments, in 2018, Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS, voiding an estimated potential financial impact of 120K to 210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about 7 USD/ton (current) to about 11 USD/ton (max. est.). c) Implementation: Physical risks associated with Climate Change are addressed as part of our Enterprise Risk Management program. We evaluated the business globally, including areas vulnerable to extreme weather events and temperatures including Asian and Latin American regions. We have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics "Plan B", Business Readiness Planning and Property Loss Control Programs that contemplate asset and resulting revenue protection through site design and improvements. Opportunities are identified through engagement with senior leadership, Global Energy Team and external stakeholders. For each opportunity a plan is put in place to reduce our footprint, deliver savings and our support our brands.
Capital expenditures / capital allocation	Impacted	a) Risk Definition: The emergence of carbon trading schemes in different geographies might require CPG companies to update their existing capital to be more energy-efficient and reduce emissions. b) Impact: In 2018, Colgate invested $33M for capital upgrades and investments, which allowed us to improve our energy efficiency at the manufacturing sites and avoid carbon tax schemes. The impact of climate change on our capital expenditures is minimal since Colgate has a well established "5% to Planet" investment initiative. Thanks to these investments, in 2018, Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS, avoiding an estimated potential financial impact of 120K to 210K USD/year from 2018 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about 7 USD/ton (current) to about 11 USD/ton (max. est.). c) Implementation: As part of Colgate's 5% for the Planet initiative, facilities are expected to invest a minimum of 5% of their annual capital budgets towards projects which reduce energy, water, and waste. In 2018, Colgate invested in 145 "planet" related projects, many of which delivered energy and carbon reduction, enabling us to maintain emission levels below regulatory thresholds in most geographies. We would expect this level of investment to be similar in the coming years, as part of our "5% for the Planet" annual CEB goal. Cost of an Energy Treasure Hunt is $38,000; energy investments as part of 5% for the Planet were over $8.6 million.
Acquisitions and divestments	Not impacted	a) Risk Definitions: Climate change is presented among the risk factors in our 2018 10-K. The predicted effects of climate change may exacerbate challenges regarding the availability and quality of water. In addition, concern over climate change may result in new or additional legal and regulatory requirements to reduce or mitigate the effects of climate change on the environment.The physical impacts of climate change can affect assets, especially due to storms and water resources. b) Impact: Not impacted, the risk is embedded in our ERM Process. c) Implementation: Physical risks associated with Climate Change are addressed as part of our Enterprise Risk Management program, as described in the previous sections. We have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental Design Standards, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics "Plan B", Business Readiness Planning and Property Loss Control Programs that contemplate asset and resulting revenue protection through site design and improvements. These measures help us avoid climate change impact-related divestments and make additional climate change-related assessment not necessary for acquisitions. The risk mitigation efforts detailed above allow us to avoid divesting assets due to the impact of climate change. And these same mitigation efforts allow us to assess new acquisitions based on this thoughtful and repeated or indoctrinated process of climate change mitigation.
Access to capital	Not impacted	Colgate has well established mechanisms to access to capital. While climate change can create physical and transitional risks as described above, these risks are not likely to create an impact on Company's access to capital.
Assets	Impacted	a) Definition of risk: The physical impacts of climate change may impact existing assets. We are engaged in manufacturing and sourcing of products and materials on a global scale. Our operations could be disrupted by natural disasters, including climatic events (including any potential effect of climate change). b) Impact: In recent years, we experienced temporary disruptions in production distribution and sales due to: Tropical Cyclone Nida, Tropical Cyclone Varda, Super Typhoon Nepartak and heavy rains and flooding in Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. One-time costs associated with Hurricane Katrina were~ $1.0. The estimated impact is low. c) Implementation: Physical risks associated with Climate Change are addressed as part of our Enterprise Risk Management program, as described above sections. We have Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, site selection protocols that consider climatic risk, Environmental Design Standards, Hurricane Contingency Planning, Logistics "Plan B", Business Readiness Planning and Property Loss Control Programs that contemplate asset and resulting revenue protection through site design and improvements.
Liabilities	Not impacted	a) Risk Definition: The European EU Emissions Trading Scheme is the cap and trade scheme that has affected two of our plants in Europe (Anzio, Italy and Compiegne, France) in the past. Sites that emit over the allowance threshold would need to purchase allowances. Over time we might expect that additional geographies and/or facilities beyond Europe may also implement climate-related trading and/or tax schemes. Were the necessary measures have not been taken, the new regulations could have had the potential to increase our liabilities over time. b) Impact: Thanks to Colgate's energy efficiency efforts, this risk has not materialized and our liabilities did not increase due to climate change-related regulations. Compiegne, France and Anzio, Italy did not participate in the ETS in 2018 due to the beneficial impact of previous energy reduction projects. Had Colgate not implemented the energy reduction programs outlined in "management methods", we would have been required to and needed to participate in the ETS to ensure compliance, the estimated potential financial impact of participating would be (avg.) from 120K to 210K USD/year from 2017 onwards, calculated with a CO2 price of about 7 USD/ton (current) to about 11 USD/ton (max. est.). c) Implementation: Our strategy for cap and trade participation is to minimize our emissions through energy reduction projects. All Colgate sites have energy and carbon reduction goals and are committed to invest 5% of our manufacturing capital program in "planet" related projects annually (such as investments in energy, carbon, water and waste reduction).
Other	Please select	

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Are climate-related issues integrated into your business strategy?

Yes

C3.1a

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

Yes, qualitative

(C3.1c) Explain how climate-related issues are integrated into your business objectives and strategy.

I. COMPANY-SPECIFIC EXPLANATION:

Colgate has expanded its capability to collect and report data related to climate change to influence our business strategies. The scope of this effort includes monitoring progress on targets and evaluation of our decision making regarding investment in energy savings and infrastructure projects at our sites. We have completed detailed carbon footprints for our Oral, Personal and Home Care categories, helping us understand our highest impact areas and opportunities for continuous improvement, such as the development of our Save Water campaign to influence the consumer use phase of our value chain (accounts for 90% of our GHGs), engagement of suppliers on climate risks (e.g. via CDP Supply Chain), and increased investments in renewable energy for our global facilities.

II. LINKAGE BETWEEN BUSINESS STRATEGY AND EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS TARGETS:

Climate and energy are issues integrated into multiple aspects of our business strategies, including supply chain, procurement, logistics, manufacturing, customer/consumer engagement and risk management. An example of linkage is how our energy reduction programs directly support our Funding the Growth cost saving initiative which is a key business strategy. Since 2002, we have avoided over $560MM in energy costs due to our investments in energy efficiency. Also, Colgate's science-based climate goals for Scopes 1, 2 and 3 were approved by the Science Based Targets initiative in April 2017. See item V below for details.

III. SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS DECISIONS MADE DURING THE REPORTING YEAR THAT HAVE BEEN INFLUENCED BY THE CLIMATE CHANGE DRIVEN ASPECTS OF THE STRATEGY:

During this past reporting year, we have made the business decision to expand the direct investments in on-site renewable energy around the world and developed a Renewable Energy Roadmap, In 2018, we implemented two additional onsite solar energy projects, one in Burlington, N.J. and one in Sri City, India, each generating 2 Megawatts of electricity. This is a climate-related mitigation decision which requires business planning and investment. We have plans in place for Natural Disasters/Climate risks as part of our Enterprise Risk Management Plan and are sharpening our Product Category Contingency Sourcing Plans, Global Procurement Risk Management Strategy, Logistics "Plan B" Business Readiness Planning. We have expanded our efforts to reach all of our consumers with water conservation messaging. As part of our No Deforestation Policy , in 2018 we requested information on palm oil derivatives traceability work to the mill level. Earthworm Foundation has determined key supply chain points to act as milestones in the work to achieve full traceability upstream (first importer, origin refiner and mills).

We are also working to streamline our data collection process and improve our capabilities to better analyze the data to help make better business decisions. Our Enterprise Risk Management process is used to identify, assess, prioritize and manage physical and climate-related risks, and shapes our business strategy by informing our sourcing and contingency planning processes and infrastructure investment decision-making.

IV. WHAT ASPECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE HAVE INFLUENCED THE STRATEGY (E.G. NEED FOR ADAPTATION, REGULATORY CHANGES, OR OPPORTUNITIES TO DEVELOP GREEN BUSINESS):

Several aspects of climate change have influenced our strategy around renewable energy, including risk mitigation, resiliency, market improvements in technology, and our approved science-based climate target. The physical risks of climate change have influenced our strategy by sharpening our focus on climate resilience to prevent and mitigate disruption. For example, we implement a robust enterprise risk management program to ensure continuity of supply of climate-sensitive raw materials and business readiness in the event of manufacturing or logistics disruption associated with a significant climatic event. Annually Colgate tests our Business Readiness Plans at all sites and implements our Hurricane Contingency Plan which increases the inventory of key materials from the Gulf of Mexico, where we have been impacted by Hurricanes. We are also working to engage with our consumers and have launched a broad-based program to engage the consumer in water conservation which helps reduce energy needed, hence, carbon emissions associated with treating, pumping and heating water. For this purpose, we have rolled out water conservation messaging over 60 countries.

V. HOW THE SHORT-TERM STRATEGY HAS BEEN INFLUENCED BY CLIMATE CHANGE:

The most important components of the short-term strategy that have been influenced by climate change are associated are associated with the physical, regulatory and other risks and consumer opportunities associated with climate change. These include water stress, precipitation extremes and droughts, changes in consumer behavior and corporate reputation. More specifically, we continued to evaluate physical risks at our manufacturing sites. Colgate's strategy has also been influenced by increasing stakeholder expectations relating to the carbon footprint of our products.

Colgate's science-based climate goals for Scopes 1, 2 and 3 were approved by the Science Based Targets initiative in April 2017. Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reducing absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50 percent reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions. These efforts support our business strategy to "Fund the Growth" and improve margin.

VI. HOW THE LONG-TERM STRATEGY HAS BEEN INFLUENCED BY CLIMATE CHANGE:

The most important components of the long term strategy (ten-year horizon) relate to the development of new technology, integration of sustainability into our Product Category Architecture and Brand Equities and development of next generation climate change goals as part of our Sustainability Strategy, including a 2050 goal to reduce absolute emissions by 50%. Our Technology Alliance group is exploring developmental green ingredient and packaging material technologies.

VII. STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE: Further, as consumer insight and new technology come together it will help to strengthen Colgate's position in the marketplace and help to drive topline growth. We are actively managing climate-related risk and opportunities that will help ensure long-term availability of raw materials and water, consumer preferred products and limit disruption to our supply chain in the event of a significant climatic event. Thanks to our progress to date, including Energy Star Partner of the Year recognition, and our continued efforts in this area, Colgate has an opportunity to be well-positioned to meet or exceed the expectations of our customers, consumers, current and prospective employees and other stakeholders, providing us a competitive advantage.

C3.1d

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

Climate-related scenarios	Details
2DS	i. Colgate has a Science Based Target, approved by the SBTi. In order to create these targets, Colgate used the 2DS in relation to the suggested methodologies by SBT. Additionally, following the TCFD guidelines Colgate has started its research to identify best ways to include scenario analysis in its business strategy. In 2017, Colgate has worked with a team of students from MIT Sloan School of Management in their Sustainability-Lab (S-Lab) program on a project to better understand the components of a robust scenario analysis and identify the next steps to implement it. The project has been completed with success and the results have been published on MIT's website. These results will be used as guidance to establish a robust methodology for a climate-related scenario analysis that best fits to Colgate's needs. The selected scenario was identified via discussions with the SBTi, including suggested inputs, assumptions and analytical methods. ii. The time horizon considered was discussed and agreed to with SBTi, utilizing 2002 as the base year since that was most relevant to our organization as the time we began tracking CO2 emissions. iii. The primary area of our organisation that was considered as part of the SBT scenario analysis was global operations since this is where our direct emissions are and the area where we had CO2 data. The SBT modeling conducted was specific to our organizations sector, emissions and target years (2020 and 2050). iv. The SBT scenario analysis results included a projected target reduction of absolute emissions of 25% by 2020 and 50% by 2050 using our 2002 base year. v. The results of the SBT scenario analysis have informed our business objectives and strategy by setting an absolute (vs intensity) target on GHGs, which has then driven evaluations and investment decisions related to our increased use of renewable energy and green power purchases. vi. For example, the results of the SBT scenario analysis have spurred direct investment in several on-site solar projects now underway in the US and India, with others being evaluated in the US, China, Vietnam and Mexico.
Please select	

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

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

Absolute target

C4.1a

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

Target reference number

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the "Linear Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761
2016
2002
25
95
Scope 1 +2 (market-based)
Abs 1

Scope

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the "Linear Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761
2016

2002
25
95
Scope 1 +2 (market-based)

It is noted that our 2020 Science-Based emissions target (25% reduction of Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions) does not include fugitive emissions as fugitive emissions were not included in our base year emissions (2002) and because fugitive emissions are a small fraction (approximately 1%) of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions.

% emissions in Scope

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761
2016
2002
25
95

Targeted % reduction from base year

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761
2016
2002
25

Base year

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761
2016
2002

Start year

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed

by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761
2016

Base year emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020
699761

Target year

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2020

Is this a science-based target?

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative

% of target achieved

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved
100

Target status

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on

the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).
Achieved

Please explain

Through 2018, we achieved a 29.7% reduction in our Scope 1 (without fugitive emissions) + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions versus our 2020 goal of 25% reduction. Fugitive emissions are not included in our 2020 goal because these emissions are a small fraction of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 market-based emissions (1.3 %) and because fugitive emissions are not included in our agreed upon Science-Based target. It is noted that approximately 95% of our Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions are included in this target. The emission sources that are not covered by this target include a number of Colgate owned offices, warehouses and mobile sources (cars and trucks) for which we do not have energy consumption data and as indicated fugitive emission sources, e.g., refrigerants, SF6. Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed the 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the "Linear Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA).

Target reference number

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the "Linear Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.
Underway
59
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2050
699761
2016
2002
50
95
Scope 1 +2 (market-based)
Abs 2

Scope

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the "Linear Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.
Underway
59
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2050
699761
2016
2002
50
95
Scope 1 +2 (market-based)

It is noted that our 2050 Science-Based emissions target (50 % reduction of Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions) does not include fugitive emissions as fugitive emissions were included not in our base year emissions (2002) and because fugitive emissions are projected to be a small fraction (approximately 2 %) of our 2050 Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions.

% emissions in Scope

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the "Linear Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's "RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway," one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach" to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.
Underway
59
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2050
699761
2016
2002
50
95

Targeted % reduction from base year

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

Underway

59

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

2050

699761

2016

2002

50

Base year

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

Underway

59

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

2050

699761

2016

2002

Start year

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

Underway

59

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

2050

699761

2016

Base year emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

Underway

59

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

2050

699761

Target year

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

Underway

59

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

2050

Is this a science-based target?

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with

CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.
Underway
59
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative

% of target achieved

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.
Underway
59

Target status

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.
Underway

Please explain

Our climate strategy is anchored in setting and achieving science-based goals to reduce greenhouse gases. As part of our 2015 to 2020 Sustainability Strategy, Colgate developed 2020 and 2050 science-based goals to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions by 25% and 50%, respectively, compared to 2002. Colgate collaborated with CDP to develop these goals. Early on, CDP reviewed these goals and indicated that the 2020 and 2050 targets exceeded the requirements of the “Linear Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “RCP 2.6 Carbon Pathway,” one of the climate trajectories used for modeling and research. Our 2020 target also exceeds the requirements of the “Sectoral Decarbonization Approach” to a science-based goal, which is based on the 2°C change in global average temperature scenario developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA). To meet 50% reduction goal of Scope 1 + Scope 2 emissions by 2050 with 2002 base year, we should achieve the percent reduction of Scope1 + Scope 2 emissions that we attained through 2018 by 2031 indicating that we are ahead of schedule. The principal reason for the reduction is our purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

Target reference number

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000
2016
2016
5
90
Scope 3: Use of sold products
Abs 3

Scope

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000
2016
2016
5
90
Scope 3: Use of sold products

% emissions in Scope

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company

commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000
2016
2016
5
90

Targeted % reduction from base year

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000
2016
2016
5

Base year

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000
2016
2016

Start year

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000
2016

Base year emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative
2022
49830000

Target year

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative

2022

Is this a science-based target?

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100
Yes, this target has been approved as science-based by the Science-Based Targets initiative

% of target achieved

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved
100

Target status

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.
Achieved

Please explain

In 2017, the SBTi approved Colgate's science based target which included a Scope 3 aspect related to consumer use of our products: Colgate-Palmolive Company commits to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing by 25% from 2002 to 2020, with a longer term goal of a 50% reduction by 2050. Colgate also commits, as a way to reduce our most significant Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions, to promote water conservation awareness to 100% of our global consumers and reduce emissions associated with consumer behavior by up to 5% from 2016 to 2022, and increase the recycled content of our packaging to 50% by 2020. We estimate achieving a median value of 5% reduction in emissions associated with consumer behavior, relative to a 2016 baseline and based on consumer survey results from 2018 . Reduction estimates range from 3-7% due to inherent variability in consumer behaviors.

C4.2

(C4.2) Provide details of other key climate-related targets not already reported in question C4.1/a/b.

Target

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215
2020
2016
2016
Purchased electricity (MWh)
Renewable energy generated onsite (MWh) that is consumed onsite plus purchased unbundled Renewable Energy Certificates (MWh)
Renewable electricity consumption

KPI – Metric numerator

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215
2020
2016
2016
Purchased electricity (MWh)
Renewable energy generated onsite (MWh) that is consumed onsite plus purchased unbundled Renewable Energy Certificates (MWh)

KPI – Metric denominator (intensity targets only)

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25%

of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215
2020
2016
2016
Purchased electricity (MWh)

Base year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215
2020
2016
2016

Start year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215
2020
2016

Target year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215
2020

KPI in baseline year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25
0.215

KPI in target year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100
0.25

% achieved in reporting year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved
100

Target Status

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2

Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.
Achieved

Please explain
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Colgate has 2020 goals to promote the use of renewable energy and reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions. By 2020, Colgate will seek to obtain a minimum of 25% of its global purchased electricity from renewable energy sources and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. For this target, renewable energy sources include unbundled RECs that Colgate purchases. Our renewable energy target is internal and supports our absolute greenhouse gas reduction goal. Colgate has achieved this goal.

Part of emissions target
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
Abs1, Abs2

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

Target
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519
2020
2015
2002
Production Tonnage (MT)
Total Global Energy Consumption at Manufacturing Sites (MWh)
Energy productivity

KPI – Metric numerator
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519
2020
2015
2002
Production Tonnage (MT)
Total Global Energy Consumption at Manufacturing Sites (MWh)

KPI – Metric denominator (intensity targets only)
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519
2020
2015
2002
Production Tonnage (MT)

Base year
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519
2020
2015
2002

Start year
Science-based targets initiative

Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519
2020
2015

Target year
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519
2020

KPI in baseline year
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343
0.519

KPI in target year
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2
0.343

% achieved in reporting year
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway
96.2

Target Status
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Underway

Please explain
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.

Part of emissions target
Science-based targets initiative
Abs1, Abs2

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?
Science-based targets initiative

Target
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of ‘Zero Waste’ and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68

2020
2015
2010
Production tonnage (MT)
Mass of Landfill Waste (kg) Landfilled wastes include wastes that are disposed in a landfill, wastes that are treated and disposed offsite and the solids in aqueous wastes that are hauled offsite
Waste

KPI – Metric numerator

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68
2020
2015
2010
Production tonnage (MT)
Mass of Landfill Waste (kg) Landfilled wastes include wastes that are disposed in a landfill, wastes that are treated and disposed offsite and the solids in aqueous wastes that are hauled offsite

KPI – Metric denominator (intensity targets only)

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68
2020
2015
2010
Production tonnage (MT)

Base year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68
2020
2015
2010

Start year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68
2020
2015

Target year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68
2020

KPI in baseline year

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34
10.68

KPI in target year
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3
5.34

% achieved in reporting year
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway
95.3

Target Status
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Underway

Please explain
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No
Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.

Part of emissions target
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative
No

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?
No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

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	5	500
To be implemented*	5	2000
Implementation commenced*	12	10306
Implemented*	31	21724
Not to be implemented	4	0

C4.3b

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

Initiative type
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
483000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
512
Combined heat and power
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

483000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
512
Combined heat and power

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
483000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
512

Scope
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
483000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
483000
160000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
483000
160000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
483000

Payback period
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.
11-15 years

Comment
The project entails replacing three electricity driven chillers with a steam absorption unit that is powered with excess steam from the site's cogeneration (CHP) facility.

Initiative type
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1150
Solar PV
Low-carbon energy installation

Description of initiative
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1150
Solar PV

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.

11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1150

Scope
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000
160000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000
160000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000
160000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
738000

Payback period
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.
11-15 years

Comment
The facility installed a 1 MW onsite solar unit.

Initiative type
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000
88000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
713
Motors and drives
Energy efficiency: Building services

Description of initiative
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000
88000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
713
Motors and drives

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000
88000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
713

Scope

Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000
88000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000
88000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000
88000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years
143000

Payback period
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump
11-15 years

Comment
Installation of variable frequency drives, energy efficient pumps and motors, air cooling units and condensate recovery pump

---

Initiative type
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000
92000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
918
Compressed air
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000
92000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
918
Compressed air

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000
92000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
918

Scope
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000
92000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000
92000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000
92000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
468000

Payback period
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.
11-15 years

Comment
The project entailed replacing two 30 year old screw compressors with one centrifugal compressor.

Initiative type
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years
90000
61000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
332
Lighting
Energy efficiency: Building services

Description of initiative
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years
90000
61000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
332
Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years
90000
61000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
332

Scope
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years
90000
61000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years
90000
61000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures

11-15 years
1-3 years
90000
61000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years
90000

Payback period
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures
11-15 years

Comment
The project entails the installation of automatic lighting controls, including motion sensors, as well as improved lighting fixtures

---

Initiative type
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years
103275
51059
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1989
Solar PV
Low-carbon energy purchase

Description of initiative
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years
103275
51059
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1989
Solar PV

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years
103275
51059
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1989

Scope
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years
103275
51059
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years
103275
51059
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years
103275
51059

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years

103275

Payback period
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Solar to light an office/ administration building
11-15 years

Comment
Solar to light an office/ administration building

Initiative type
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369
233229
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1709
Machine replacement
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369
233229
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1709
Machine replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369
233229
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
1709

Scope
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369
233229
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369
233229
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369
233229

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years
246369

Payback period
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11
11-15 years

Comment
Packaging Equipment (Sidel) in Sprays Line 11

Initiative type
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544
64772
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
520
Cooling technology
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544
64772
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
520
Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544
64772
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
520

Scope
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544
64772
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544
64772
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544
64772

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
192544

Payback period
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project
11-15 years

Comment
Chillers (#11 & #12) Replacement Project

Initiative type
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584
54071

Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
434
Compressed air
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584
54071
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
434
Compressed air

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584
54071
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
434

Scope
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584
54071
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584
54071
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584
54071

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
163584

Payback period
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)
11-15 years

Comment
Compressor Replacement Project (# 6 & #8)

Initiative type
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
145427
50000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
392
Solar Hot Water
Low-carbon energy purchase

Description of initiative
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years

4 - 10 years
145427
50000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
392
Solar Hot Water

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
145427
50000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
392

Scope
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
145427
50000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
145427
50000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
145427
50000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
145427

Payback period
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller
11-15 years

Comment
Solar Powered Absorption Chiller

Initiative type
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342
25000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
377
Other, please specify (vacuum system)
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342
25000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
377
Other, please specify (vacuum system)

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342
25000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
377

Scope
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342
25000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342
25000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342
25000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
116342

Payback period
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
High efficiency vacuum system
11-15 years

Comment
High efficiency vacuum system

Initiative type
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000
48000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
357
Cooling technology
Energy efficiency: Processes

Description of initiative
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000
48000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
357
Cooling technology

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000
48000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
357

Scope
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000
48000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000
48000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000
48000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
190000

Payback period
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Improvements to chilled water system
11-15 years

Comment
Improvements to chilled water system

Initiative type
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662
39113
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
338
Lighting
Energy efficiency: Building services

Description of initiative
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662
39113
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
338
Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662
39113
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
338

Scope
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662
39113
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662
39113
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662
39113

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years
87662

Payback period
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights
11-15 years

Comment
Upgrade lighting system with LED lights

Initiative type
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000
603000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
2003
<Not Applicable>
Other, please specify (Combined effect of 17 relatively small projects)

Description of initiative
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000
603000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
2003
<Not Applicable>

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000
603000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)
2003

Scope
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000
603000
Voluntary
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory

Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000
603000
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000
603000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years
1272000

Payback period
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years
4 - 10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.
11-15 years

Comment
Projects include: HVAC units for electrical substation, optimization of the energy management system, pneumatic handling system improvements, steam system improvements, cooling tower automation, new air compressor, vacuum pump improvement, energy reduction in the cooling system, automation of wastewater treatment facility, multiple lighting improvements, dry coolers for air compressors, solar panels, other automation projects.

Initiative type
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000
0
Voluntary
Scope 2 (market-based)
9981
Wind
Low-carbon energy purchase

Description of initiative
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000
0
Voluntary
Scope 2 (market-based)
9981
Wind

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000
0
Voluntary
Scope 2 (market-based)
9981

Scope
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000
0
Voluntary

Scope 2 (market-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000
0
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000
0

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback
75000

Payback period
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years
No payback

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.
1-2 years

Comment
Purchased 220000 Green e certified unbundled RECs from a wind farm in the state of Kansas, USA.

C4.3c

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

Method	Comment
Internal finance mechanisms	Colgate seeks to invest 5% of our capital budget in projects that reduce energy and water consumption and waste generation. In 2018, 62 capital energy savings projects were in various stages of implementation. These projects are estimated to reduce our energy consumption by 18,000 MWh and reduce our CO2 emissions by 12,700 MT. Since this program's inception in 2008, Colgate has funded over 1,040 energy projects
Employee engagement	In 2018, four Energy Treasure Hunts (ETH) were completed in the United States, Italy, Mexico and France. These Treasure Hunts identified 205 energy savings ideas with the potential to reduce CP's energy consumption by over 41,350 MWh and CO2 emissions by more than 11,500 MT. Since its inception, this program has identified over 1,960 energy savings projects with the potential to reduce Colgate's energy consumption by 349,754 MWh and CO2 emissions by 121,824 MT. We estimate that nearly 880 Colgate employees have participated in an ETH event, raising energy reduction awareness at 24 individual facilities, representing about 73% of our global energy spend.
Internal incentives/recognition programs	In 2018, Colgate was honored to receive the Sustained Excellence award for the seventh year in a row (eighth award received). For the seventh year Colgate presented each of our North American facilities with "ENERGY STAR Partner of the Year" flags to proudly display at their facilities, increasing the visibility of Colgate's ENERGY STAR commitment in the communities in which we operate. Colgate uses the USEPA ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry as our energy reduction recognition program. All Colgate manufacturing sites are enrolled in the Challenge, and 81% of our Plants have achieved the Challenge, including 87% of Oral Care plants, 100% of Personal Care plants, 77% of Home Care plants and 50% of Pet Nutrition plants. This award recognizes sites that achieve a 10% reduction in source energy intensity within 5 years. This past year: Anzio Italy, Athens Greece, Burlington NJ, Emporia Kansas, Cali Colombia, Hawley & Hazel China, and Topeka Kansas sites won the award. Winning sites are provided with a certificate of recognition from the USEPA and an Achievement Banner from the Vice President Global Supply Chain and Vice President of Global Sustainability and EHS. Winning sites are also recognized on the Company's Intranet site.

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

Other: We estimated base energy consumption (kwh) without use of the fabric softener by dividing the estimated quantity of clothing treated (kgs) by the expected energy consumption for an electric dryer (3.01 kgs clothing dried/ kwh). This value is based upon Department of Energy Standard for residential dryers. To estimate energy savings from product use, we multiplied the estimated energy consumption (kwh) without product use by the percent reduction of dryer time achieved during the residential scale electric dryer tests with use of the product. To calculate the avoidance in CO2 emissions, we multiplied the reduction in electricity consumption (kwh) in United States times the average CO2 emission factor (kgs CO2/ kwh of electricity).

1

Other, please specify (USDOE stds & WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol)

Avoided emissions

Colgate's "fast dry" technology available in fabric softener products such as Suavitel Fast Dry fabric softener and Suavitel Complete products brings a unique technology that wicks away water from fabric to help clothes dry faster, saving consumers time and energy. Examples of Other Products with Improved Sustainability Profiles: - Protex Pro-Hidrata, a soap product, was reformulated using a glycerin by-product, which improved its environmental ingredient profile and reduced the water and energy consumed during manufacturing. - Tom's of Maine Long Lasting Stick Deodorant was reformulated with ingredients with an improved sustainability profile that also improves the consumer experience. Additionally, the manufacturing process was simplified saving both water and energy. - Optimization of secondary and tertiary packaging for Hill's Digestive Care Prescription Diet reduced material consumption and energy/GHG associated with movement of finished goods. In 2017 we performed a "deep dive" investigation into fat and oil raw materials to quantify and compare carbon and water impacts for bar soap formulations. This involved researching upstream feedstock and manufacturing pathways for fats and oils, creating and issuing a supplier questionnaire on energy and water use and quantifying carbon and water impacts, as well as potential carbon reductions.

Group of products

Description of product/Group of products

Other: We estimated base energy consumption (kwh) without use of the fabric softener by dividing the estimated quantity of clothing treated (kgs) by the expected energy consumption for an electric dryer (3.01 kgs clothing dried/ kwh). This value is based upon Department of Energy Standard for residential dryers. To estimate energy savings from product use, we multiplied the estimated energy consumption (kwh) without product use by the percent reduction of dryer time achieved during the residential scale electric dryer tests with use of the product. To calculate the avoidance in CO2 emissions, we multiplied the reduction in electricity consumption (kwh) in United States times the average CO2 emission factor (kgs CO2/ kwh of electricity).

1

Other, please specify (USDOE stds & WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol)

Avoided emissions

Colgate's "fast dry" technology available in fabric softener products such as Suavitel Fast Dry fabric softener and Suavitel Complete products brings a unique technology that wicks away water from fabric to help clothes dry faster, saving consumers time and energy. Examples of Other Products with Improved Sustainability Profiles: - Protex Pro-Hidrata, a soap product, was reformulated using a glycerin by-product, which improved its environmental ingredient profile and reduced the water and energy consumed during manufacturing. - Tom's of Maine Long Lasting Stick Deodorant was reformulated with ingredients with an improved sustainability profile that also improves the consumer experience. Additionally, the manufacturing process was simplified saving both water and energy. - Optimization of secondary and tertiary packaging for Hill's Digestive Care Prescription Diet reduced material consumption and energy/GHG associated with movement of finished goods. In 2017 we performed a "deep dive" investigation into fat and oil raw materials to quantify and compare carbon and water impacts for bar soap formulations. This involved researching upstream feedstock and manufacturing pathways for fats and oils, creating and issuing a supplier questionnaire on energy and water use and quantifying carbon and water impacts, as well as potential carbon reductions.

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

Other: We estimated base energy consumption (kwh) without use of the fabric softener by dividing the estimated quantity of clothing treated (kgs) by the expected energy consumption for an electric dryer (3.01 kgs clothing dried/ kwh). This value is based upon Department of Energy Standard for residential dryers. To estimate energy savings from product use, we multiplied the estimated energy consumption (kwh) without product use by the percent reduction of dryer time achieved during the residential scale electric dryer tests with use of the product. To calculate the avoidance in CO2 emissions, we multiplied the reduction in electricity consumption (kwh) in United States times the average CO2 emission factor (kgs CO2/ kwh of electricity).

1

Other, please specify (USDOE stds & WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol)

Avoided emissions

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

Other: We estimated base energy consumption (kwh) without use of the fabric softener by dividing the estimated quantity of clothing treated (kgs) by the expected energy consumption for an electric dryer (3.01 kgs clothing dried/ kwh). This value is based upon Department of Energy Standard for residential dryers. To estimate energy savings from product use, we multiplied the estimated energy consumption (kwh) without product use by the percent reduction of dryer time achieved during the residential scale electric dryer tests with use of the product. To calculate the avoidance in CO2 emissions, we multiplied the reduction in electricity consumption (kwh) in United States times the average CO2 emission factor (kgs CO2/ kwh of electricity).

1

Other, please specify (USDOE stds & WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol)

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

Other: We estimated base energy consumption (kwh) without use of the fabric softener by dividing the estimated quantity of clothing treated (kgs) by the expected energy consumption for an electric dryer (3.01 kgs clothing dried/ kwh). This value is based upon Department of Energy Standard for residential dryers. To estimate energy savings from product use, we multiplied the estimated energy consumption (kwh) without product use by the percent reduction of dryer time achieved during the residential scale electric dryer tests with use of the product. To calculate the avoidance in CO2 emissions, we multiplied the reduction in electricity consumption (kwh) in United States times the average CO2 emission factor (kgs CO2/ kwh of electricity).

1

Comment

Other: We estimated base energy consumption (kwh) without use of the fabric softener by dividing the estimated quantity of clothing treated (kgs) by the expected energy consumption for an electric dryer (3.01 kgs clothing dried/ kwh). This value is based upon Department of Energy Standard for residential dryers. To estimate energy savings from product use, we multiplied the estimated energy consumption (kwh) without product use by the percent reduction of dryer time achieved during the residential scale electric dryer tests with use of the product. To calculate the avoidance in CO2 emissions, we multiplied the reduction in electricity consumption (kwh) in United States times the average CO2 emission factor (kgs CO2/ kwh of electricity).

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 2002

Base year end
December 31 2002

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
286001

Comment
Between 2002 and 2010, our manufacturing sites reported the use of fuel oil, natural gas and coal with no distinction as to the type of oil, e.g. fuel oil or residual oil nor the type of coal e.g., bituminous or anthracite. Furthermore, during this period our manufacturing sites did not report the use of LPG nor did they report fugitive losses including refrigerant and SF6 losses. Our 2002 base year emissions do not include fugitive emissions. In 2010, our manufacturing sites started reporting the type of oil that was combusted, e.g., residual oil and gas oil, the type of coal that was used, e.g., anthracite and bituminous and also LPG usage and of course natural gas usage. Fugitive emissions were reported in subsequent years.

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start
January 1 2002

Base year end
December 31 2002

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
413760

Comment
We have been collecting purchased electricity consumption (MWh) since the 2002 base year. We used updated 2002 IEA emission factors (using the 2017 IEA publication), e.g. kgs CO2/MWh of purchased electricity consumed) to calculate base year Scope 2 emissions. We did not have purchased steam data covering that period so purchased steam emissions are not known. We used the latest eGRID factors for facilities located in the United States

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start
January 1 2002

Base year end
December 31 2002

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
413760

Comment
In 2002, the methodology to determine Scope 2 emissions via the market-based method had not been issued. Accordingly, we have assumed that the Scope 2 emissions for the location-based and market-based method are the same.

C5.2

(C5.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 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)
196333

Start date
January 1 2018

End date
December 31 2018

Comment

C6.2

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

Row 1

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

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

Comment

C6.3

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

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based
410725

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
301904

Start date
January 1 2018

End date
December 31 2018

Comment

C6.4

(C6.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?
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
We do not have sufficient information to estimate energy consumption at/by these sources.
Emissions are not relevant
Emissions are not relevant
Emissions are not relevant
There are a number of Colgate owned offices and warehouses that are within our reporting boundary which are not included in our disclosure. We do not have sufficient data to estimate energy consumption at these facilities. There are also a number of company-owned vehicles that are not included in our disclosure. Similarly, we do not have sufficient data to estimate fuel consumed by these vehicles.

Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source
We do not have sufficient information to estimate energy consumption at/by these sources.
Emissions are not relevant
Emissions are not relevant
Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source
We do not have sufficient information to estimate energy consumption at/by these sources.
Emissions are not relevant
Emissions are not relevant

Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source (if applicable)
We do not have sufficient information to estimate energy consumption at/by these sources.
Emissions are not relevant

Explain why this source is excluded
We do not have sufficient information to estimate energy consumption at/by these sources.

C6.5

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

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
4043730

Emissions calculation methodology
The quantity of each purchased raw material (MT) was determined by the Colgate procurement team . Where available, a mass-based emission factor was identified in the Ecoinvent database, published studies, or other Life Cycle Inventory database, for each raw material. When an emission factor was not available for a specific raw material, a surrogate emission factor was identified that is representative for the given material. The mass purchased was multiplied by the corresponding emission factor (typically expressed in kg CO2eq/kg material), to obtain a mass-based CO2e estimate for that material. The results for each raw material were summed to obtain the total CO2 emissions for this category. The methodology for quantifying impacts in this category has been updated from prior years' estimates. In prior years, packaging spend data and economic input-output emission factors were used to estimate impacts from the packaging. Starting with the 2018 CDP report (2017 data), Colgate used packaging data based on mass purchased of each packaging material type, as well as a percentage (%) of virgin and recycled contents. For this report, packaging impacts are evaluated based on mass purchased of each packaging, as well as the percentage of virgin and recycled contents. Thus, packaging material contributions to Category 1 are now considered more representative.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
10

Explanation
For our Oral Care business, approximately 25% of overall Scope 1 + 2 + 3 emissions are based on some data provided by suppliers/value chain partners. This data is specific to the energy used during manufacturing processes for the largest contributors for oral care to Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services), as well as feedstocks for these raw materials. However, these estimates are also updated using publicly available data that has been published, as well as LCI/LCA data available in both GaBi, SimaPro, and EcoInvent. The emissions estimates for the Personal Care and Home Care product categories are based on internal data, including procurement data for purchased raw materials and packaging not on data provided by our suppliers . Overall, approximately 10% of the emissions attributable to this category are based upon data provided by suppliers/ value chain partners.

Capital goods

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
134000

Emissions calculation methodology
Colgate’s 2018 capital goods spending was broken down into the following categories: machinery/equipment, buildings, construction, and real estate. The capital goods emissions were estimated using an economic input-output model developed by Carnegie Mellon Green Design Institute (2008). The boundary of the model is the cradle, e.g., oil well, agricultural field to Colgate operations. The model output is CO2 emissions (MT) per million dollars of 2002 expenditures. We ran the model for the four different categories of capital spending. The producer price indices and RS Means construction cost indices were used to adjust Colgate's 2017 capital goods expenditures back to the 2002 dollars. The model outputs, CO2 Emissions (MT)/ 2002 capital expenditures ($) for each category was multiplied by the Colgate's 2017 capital goods expenditures (converted using Means cost indices to 2002 dollars) for each category. The calculated emissions from the four categories were summed to yield the estimated CO2 emissions for this category.

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

Explanation
As indicated we use an economic input-output model to determine the CO2 emissions (MT)/ Million Dollars ($) of spending. We did not use data provided by our suppliers/ value chain partners to estimate the emissions from this category.

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

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
129000

Emissions calculation methodology
Well to tank (WTT) emissions which are associated with the extraction, processing, and refining of the fossil fuels used at Colgate’s manufacturing sites and the transportation of these fuels to Colgate sites were estimated using WTT emission factors provided by the Department of Food, Rural Affairs and Environment (2018) (DEFRA). The WTT factors for each of the fuels used at Colgate's manufacturing sites, e.g., natural gas, residual oil were multiplied by the consumption of the various fuels at Colgate global manufacturing sites. For purchased electricity, the WTT emissions associated with the extraction, processing, refining, and transportation of the primary fuels used at power stations that generate electricity used by Colgate manufacturing sites were based upon a different set of DEFRA WTT emission factors which vary by country. Colgate’s electricity consumption was broken down by country and multiplied by the country-specific WTT emission factor to obtain the WTT emissions. Finally, the emissions attributable to the loss of energy in the grids that distribute electricity to Colgate manufacturing sites, so-called Transmission and Distribution (T&D) Losses, were estimated using country-specific Transmission and Distribution emission factors provided by IEA (September 2017 edition). For US sites, we estimated T&D losses using eGRID estimates of grid losses (eGRID 2016).

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

Explanation
We use fuel and electricity purchase records provided by our energy suppliers to calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and other fuel and energy-related emissions. We also use DEFRA WTT and Transmission and Distribution factors to calculate fuel and other energy-related emissions not included in Scope 1 and Scope 2. While we use DEFRA WTT and Transmission and Distribution loss factors, we use fuel and electricity consumption data provided by energy suppliers/ value chain partners to calculate the emissions from this category.

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
436000

Emissions calculation methodology
The emissions associated with the transportation and distribution of product manufactured by and for Colgate to Colgate customers were estimated using data provided Colgate's accounting software (SAP). SAP data include the tons shipped, the origin and destination of the shipment, the mode of shipment, e.g., rail, road. The distance for each shipment is obtained from Google Maps or from the transporter. For each shipment, the quantity shipped (MT) is multiplied by the distance shipped (km) to obtain the product of weight.distance (MT.km). This value is multiplied by an emission factor (kgs CO2/MT.km) to yield CO2 emissions. The emission factor varies with the mode of the shipment. For road shipments, the factor varies with the type of the vehicle, for example, articulated vehicle or rigid van, the maximum payload, e.g., 24 MT and the percent vehicle loading, e.g., 60%, 85%. For sea shipments, the factor varies with the size of the vessel, for example, container ship versus ferry. For rail, the emission factor varies with the size of the rail system. It is estimated that the reported emissions account for approximately 85% of Colgate shipments. Certain regions in South America including Venezuela, Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile are not covered along with shipments of certain products in Asia including certain exports from China and Malaysia and shipments in certain regions in Africa. We are working to obtain the emissions from the missing regions. It is also noted that shipments from our Tier 1 suppliers to Colgate's manufacturing sites are not included. It is noted that WTT factors are not incorporated in this year's calculation of logistics emissions.

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

Explanation
Our transporter/value chain partners provide information that we use to calculate this category's emissions including vehicle size, maximum payload (MT) mode of transport, e.g., rail, sea and in some cases, the distance between the origin and destination. While It is noted that the transporter does not provide the emissions for each shipment (kgs CO2/ each shipment). Rather Colgate uses the information provided by our transporters to calculate emission factors (kgs CO2/MT.km). These emission factors are multiplied by the product of shipment weight times the distance traveled (MT.km) to calculate this category's emissions. As indicated, data provided by the transporters are used in the emissions calculation. Our transporter/value chain partners provide information that we use to calculate this category's emissions including vehicle size, maximum payload (MT) mode of transport, e.g., rail, sea and in some cases, the distance between the origin and destination. While It is noted that the transporter does not provide the emissions for each shipment (kgs CO2/ each shipment). Rather Colgate uses the information provided by our transporters to calculate emission factors (kgs CO2/MT.km). These emission factors are multiplied by the product of shipment weight times the distance traveled (MT.km) to calculate this category's emissions. As indicated, data provided by the transporters are used in the emissions calculation.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
60000

Emissions calculation methodology
Colgate uses the methods presented in Methodologies for Biogenic Emissions from Selected Source Categories: Solid Waste Disposal Wastewater Treatment to calculate methane and CO2 emissions from the wastes that are landfilled and liquid wastes that are sent to offsite anaerobic treatment systems for energy recovery. Waste management companies provide information on whether the landfill is covered and whether the landfill gas is vented or captured and combusted for energy recovery. Similarly, Colgate used the reference publication to estimate CO2 generated from wastes that are combusted at waste to energy facilities and from sludges that are treated in land-based treatment systems. Colgate also uses well-established approaches to estimate CO2 emissions from facilities where Colgate wastes are incinerated without energy recovery. The approach that Colgate uses requires that Colgate know the quantity of wastes that are generated, the methods of treatment and disposal, for example, landfilling with methane capture with energy recovery and the characteristics of the major waste streams, for example, the degradable carbon content in the waste. To increase our understanding of the aspects which control the emissions, we surveyed 33 manufacturing sites in 2015 to obtain information on the characteristics, e.g., percent plastics, the waste treatment methods, e.g., incineration, for the landfilling the percent of degradable carbon and the fraction of the landfill gas that is captured and burned for energy recovery. It is noted that Colgate manufacturing sites also report the Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) that is present in the wastewaters that are discharged to offsite wastewater treatment facilities. Colgate uses published approaches to calculate the CO2 emissions at offsite wastewater treatment facilities that handle Colgate's wastewater discharges.

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

Explanation
Each manufacturing site obtains information from their waste management contractors regarding the methods used to treat their wastes, the quantity of wastes that are treated, and for cases where wastes are landfilled, whether the landfill is covered and whether the methane gas is collected and burned for energy recovery. The waste management contractors do not provide the GHG emissions emitted to treat and dispose of each waste stream. Rather Colgate, using the aforementioned information provided by its waste management contractors calculates the emissions using emission factors that are specific for the treatment technologies.

Business travel

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
44000

Emissions calculation methodology
American Express provides a breakdown of business travel including the mode of travel e.g., road, rail or air, the class of air travel, e.g., economy, business economy, first class, and the distance traveled. Using 2018 DEFRA business travel emission factors for air, road and rail including WTT and radiant forcing factors (air), we estimate business travel emissions. Colgate estimates that the American Express Report accounts for approximately 90% of Colgate's business travel.

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

Explanation
American Express provides the distance between the origin and destination for air travel, the class of air travel, e.g., economy or business class, the number of hotels overnight stays from travel records, rental car and rail trips. Neither the airlines nor rail nor auto fleet companies provide the emissions for each travel route. Rather American Express calculates emissions using DEFRA emission factors, e.g., kgs CO2/ km for air travel multiplied by an activity level, e.g., air travel distance also provided by American Express. It is noted that the DEFRA emission factors vary with the class of air travel, e.g., economy, premium economy, business, and first class and the type of flight, e.g., short haul, international.

Employee commuting

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
75000

Emissions calculation methodology
Colgate based its estimate of employee commuting on an employee survey conducted for one of its business units. The survey covered the travel habits of employees working at manufacturing sites and offices located in Poland, United States, China, Brazil, India, Thailand, Mexico and Vietnam. The survey assessed the fraction of commuting traveled by bus, train, car, motorcycle and bicycle and distance traveled. 2018 DEFRA emission factors (kgs CO2/ km for various modes of travel. WTT factors were used to estimate emissions. The survey results were then scaled up to estimate the employee commuting emissions for the entire company.

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

Explanation
The commuting distance and the mode of the commute are generated by Colgate colleagues. The emissions factors are developed by DEFRA. It is noted that to develop the emission factors, DEFRA must be in contact with its value chain partners, e.g., car fleet managers, motorcycle, bus and rail companies.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
85000

Emissions calculation methodology
Colgate leased assets include offices, warehouses, its worldwide car fleet and a fleet of small trucks which deliver pet nutrition products to customers. Colgate maintains a record of the floor area in each of it leased offices and warehouses. Colgate uses factors published by the US Department of Energy to estimate fuel consumption, e.g., natural gas per square meter of office or warehouse area and electricity consumption (kwh) per square meter of office or warehouse area. Colgate used average country-specific grid factors (kgs CO2/ MWh) to estimate emissions associated with electricity consumption. WTT and T&D losses are accounted for in the calculation Standard fossil fuel factors (kgs CO2/ liter of fuel oil) were used to estimate emissions from fossil fuel consumption. Car fleet emissions were determined by multiplying the distance each vehicle travels times a DEFRA (2018) emission factor (grams CO2/ km traveled). It is noted that the emission factor is a function of the engine displacement. Truck emissions were determined by multiplying fuel consumption (liters of diesel used by the truck fleet) times a published emission factor for diesel fuel (grams CO2/ liter of diesel). The emissions from offices, warehouses, car fleet and truck fleet were then added to yield the estimated emissions from this category.

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

Explanation
For car fleet emissions, the number of vehicles, vehicle size and emission factors are provided by Colgate's car fleet managers. For leased offices and warehouses, the leased areas and locations are provided by the lessors. Diesel fuel consumption for Colgate's leased trucks is provided by companies that sell diesel fuel. It is noted that the suppliers and business chain partners do not generate the estimated emissions, but the information provided by the value chain partners is used by Colgate to estimate the emissions for this category

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
The emission sources in this category include the emissions associated with the transport of Colgate products from our customers' warehouses to the consumers of our products. The distances between our customer's warehouses and the consumers of our products are significantly less than the distances in the upstream transportation category. For example, in the US, Colgate has one manufacturing plant that produces personal care products. The distance involved in shipping product from this one manufacturing sites to US customers is greater than the distance from the location of our customers, e.g., retail warehouses to the consumers, e.g., retail outlets. The magnitude of the emissions for this category will be less than for the upstream transportation category. Furthermore, the potential for emissions reduction that could be influenced by Colgate is limited. Once in hand, the customer has exclusive control of the product. Colgate views the risks associated with our customers' distribution of its products to the consumer to be minimal.

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
The sale of Colgate products and intermediates that require additional processing, e.g. the sale of off-spec detergent solution to a company that further processes the material to produce a product for sale to a car wash is minimal and not relevant. Colgate almost exclusively produces products, e.g. toothpaste, liquid hand soap that are directly used by the consumer. Furthermore, the potential for emissions reduction that could be influenced by Colgate is limited. This is not a relevant category for Colgate.

Use of sold products

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
44651000

Emissions calculation methodology
For our oral care products, consumer use impacts are estimated based on time spent brushing teeth extrapolated into water and electricity use (for lights) for that time period. For Personal and Home Care: - Consumer use impact numbers have a wide range of possible values, and are determined by a variety of underlying assumptions per use event including product type, product quantity use, energy use, water use, electricity grid factors, incoming tap water temperature, water temperature used during product use, regional consumer habits, and appliance efficiency. Once these assumptions were determined (based on information available from CP's Consumer Insights Team, market surveys, and publicly available information), estimates were developed for kg CO2e per product use and multiplied by the total number of product uses (based on company sales data) in order to determine a mass based CO2e estimate for each product sub-category. The key methodology change since last year's estimate is the inclusion of carbon impacts for pumping water to consumers, and then pumping and treating used water after consumer use.

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

Explanation
The assumptions used to estimate emissions, of consumer use of sold products are based upon surveys of Colgate's consumers, input from Colgate's consumer insight teams and publicly available information. As in other Scope 3 categories, the consumers and other value chain partners do not provide CO2 emissions per use. Rather the consumers and value chain partners provide information that allows Colgate to calculate emissions attributable to product use.

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
1544000

Emissions calculation methodology
The methodology for quantifying impacts in this category has been updated. Previous end of life estimates were based on packaging spend data and an assumed percentage of recycled corrugate. End of life treatment estimates are now more representative than they were in prior years, due to more detailed packaging purchase data, which accounts for mass purchased of each packaging material type, as well as percentage (%) of virgin and recycled content. Packaging material type and industry average end of life treatment (landfill, recycling, incineration) pathways, along with corresponding emission factors were used to estimate impacts. Additionally, in this year's report, the impact of wastewater treatment from consumer water use has been shifted from Category 11 to Category 12, per the WRI methodology, Cat 12 is the appropriate category to include this impact. So the Category 11 total impact has decreased by the Category 12 impact has increased.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
25

Explanation
The additional information obtained from the packaging suppliers on our packing materials allows us to determine with more accuracy the mode of treatment and disposal of our sold products and hence the emissions. Similar to the purchased goods and services category, we estimate that 25% of the information is provided by suppliers/ value chain partners.

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
The emissions from this category are not relevant. The emissions attributable to Colgate products from our customer's warehouses and leased automobiles and offices will be significantly less than the emissions from Colgate's leased assets

Franchises

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
This source of Scope 3 emissions is not applicable to Colgate

Investments

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
This source of Scope 3 emissions is not applicable to Colgate

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
This source of Scope 3 emissions is not applicable to Colgate

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

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

Explanation
This source of Scope 3 emissions is not applicable to Colgate

C6.7

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

C6.10

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

Intensity figure
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased
4.4
Market-based
15544000000
unit total revenue
498238
0.0000321

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased
4.4
Market-based
15544000000
unit total revenue
498238

Metric denominator
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased
4.4
Market-based
15544000000
unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased
4.4
Market-based
15544000000

Scope 2 figure used
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased
4.4
Market-based

% change from previous year
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased
4.4

Direction of change
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue
Decreased

Reason for change
Emissions decreased YoY and that the reasons for change included emissions reduction activities. The reasons for change included emissions reduction activities include: - Increased REC purchase, - energy efficiency initiatives, - a significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, - 0.6% increase in revenue

---

Intensity figure
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased
3.4
Market-based
5054342
metric ton of product
498238
0.099

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased
3.4
Market-based
5054342
metric ton of product
498238

Metric denominator
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased
3.4
Market-based
5054342
metric ton of product

Metric denominator: Unit total
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased
3.4
Market-based
5054342

Scope 2 figure used
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased
3.4
Market-based

% change from previous year
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased
3.4

Direction of change
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement
Decreased

Reason for change
Increased REC purchase, significant reduction in energy consumption at one site due to local business conditions, energy efficiency improvement

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

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

C7.1a

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
CO2	189737	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
CH4	125	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
N2O	143	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
HFCs	6246	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
SF6	78	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

C7.2

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Africa	12842
Asia, Australasia	24834
Europe	41686
Latin America (LATAM)	63019
United States of America	53952

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)
Home Care	63570
Oral Care	23796
Personal Care	60314
Pet Nutrition	44470
Other: R&D	4184

C7.3c

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Stationary Combustion	190009
Fugitives	6324

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 in market-based approach (MWh)
Africa	8667	8667	9355	0
Asia, Australasia	182572	182572	338644	0
Europe	40713	46671	93852	191
Latin America (LATAM)	57551	57551	199826	31
United States of America	121222	6443	232349	220000

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 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Home Care	89104	54473
Oral Care	192065	181606
Personal Care	58355	46225
Pet Nutrition	56489	15763
Other: R&D	14712	3835

C7.6c

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

Activity	Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Production Related	396615	298671
Research & Development	14110	3234

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	9981	Decreased	1.9	Colgate's Scope 1+ Scope 2 (Market Based Emissions) decreased from 517,932 MT in 2017 to 498,238 MT in 2018 yielding a 3.8% reduction in Scope 1 + 2 (Market Based) emissions ((498,238-517,932)/517,932)= -3.8%. The reduction in emissions between 2017 & 2018 was 19,695MT. COlgate increased its RECs purchases from 200,000 in 2017 to 220,000 RECs in 2018. The 20,000 additional RECs resulted in a 9981 MT reduction of Scope 2 (market based) emissions between 2017 and 2018. The methodology to calculate the 9981 MT reduction follows: (2017 Scope 2 Market Based emissions -2017 Scope 2 Location Based emissions)/ RECs purchased in 2017 (316,398-416,211)/200000. This value was multiplied by the increase in REC purchases between 2017 and 2018 which was (220000 - 200000)= 20000. So (316398-416211)/200000 * 20000=-9981. The -9981 reduction equates to a 1.9% reduction in 2017 Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions (-9981/517,932)=-1.9% reduction. Note that 517932 is the 2017 Scope1 + Scope 2 (Market Based Emissions).
Other emissions reduction activities	11743	Decreased	2.3	Various emission reduction projects effected a reduction of Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based Emissions). The reduction in 2018 Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based Emissions) attributed to emission reduction projects was 11,743 MT yielding a 2.3 % reduction in 2017 Scope 1 + Scope 2 (Market Based) emissions (-11,743/ 517,932)=-2.3 %. These emission reduction projects included solar lighting for an office building, installation of energy efficient motors, replacement of compressors and chillers , lighting automation, LED lighting, installation of more efficient packaging equipment, use of excess steam from an onsite cogeneration facility to power an absorption chiller, automation of a wastewater treatment process, various energy optimization processes. The 31 projects that are responsible for the reduction along with the emissions reductions are listed in C4.3b. The electricity and fossil fuel reductions were estimated by the project teams. A database multiplied the projected reduction of electricity consumption (MWh) for each project times average grid factor (kgs CO2/MWh) for the country/ region and the projected fuel savings, e.g., cubic meters of natural gas times the average emission factor, e.g., kgs CO2/ cubic meters of natural gas. The database added the projected reduction in CO2 from fuel savings and electricity savings.
Divestment		<Not Applicable>		
Acquisitions		<Not Applicable>		
Mergers		<Not Applicable>		
Change in output		<Not Applicable>		
Change in methodology	2029	Increased	0.4	The methodology used to estimate refrigerant (HFCs) losses to air was changed in 2018. In prior years, site service refrigerant technicians estimated HFC losses to air via mass balance , i.e., the amount added during servicing minus the amount removed from the equipment that was not recharged equals loss to air. In 2018, we modified the methodology for sites that used HFC refrigerants but reported zero losses to air. For these sites, we took the full charge HFC refrigerant capacity, that is, the amount of refrigerant in the cooling unit (kgs) and multiplied this value by 10% which is the assumed annual average refrigerant loss rate from HVAC or chiller installation. We multiplied this value by the GWP of the refrigerant. To this value we added the HFC loss to air determined via the mass balance method. The updated method resulted in our increasing HFC emissions (as CO2-e) by 2029 MT over what was determined via the mass balance method alone. 2029 MT increase was obtained by applying the 10% of full charge method to 16 manufacturing sites. The percent increase in emissions due to change in methodology was (2029/517932)=+.4%.
Change in boundary		<Not Applicable>		
Change in physical operating conditions		<Not Applicable>		
Unidentified		<Not Applicable>		
Other		<Not Applicable>		

C7.9b

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

Market-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

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

More than 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 undertakes this energy-related activity
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 MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	LHV (lower heating value)	0	924884	924884
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	220000	593686	813686
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	0	60340	60340
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	222	<Not Applicable>	222
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	220222	1578911	1799133

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	Yes
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)

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results
235466
<Not Applicable>
493005
123251
0
851722
LHV (lower heating value)
Natural Gas

Heating value

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results
235466
<Not Applicable>
493005
123251
0
851722
LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results
235466
<Not Applicable>
493005

123251
0
851722

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

235466
<Not Applicable>
493005
123251
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

235466
<Not Applicable>
493005
123251

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

235466
<Not Applicable>
493005

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

235466
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

235466

Comment

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

---

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
13445
3361
0
16807
LHV (lower heating value)
Residual Fuel Oil

Heating value

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
13445
3361
0
16807
LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
13445
3361
0

16807

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

13445

3361

0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

13445

3361

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

13445

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

0

Comment

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self-generation of heat and the self-generation of steam is based upon the survey results

---

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

15039

3760

0

18799

LHV (lower heating value)

Fuel Oil Number 2

Heating value

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

15039

3760

0

18799

LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0

<Not Applicable>

15039

3760

0

18799

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>
15039
3760
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>
15039
3760

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>
15039

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0

Comment
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

---

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>
6035
1509
0
7544
LHV (lower heating value)
Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)

Heating value
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>
6035
1509
0
7544
LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results
0
<Not Applicable>
6035
1509
0
7544

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
6035
1509
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
6035
1509

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
6035

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0

Comment

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

---

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
24010
6003
0
30013
LHV (lower heating value)
Bituminous Coal

Heating value

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
24010
6003
0
30013
LHV (lower heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
24010
6003
0
30013

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>

24010
6003
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
24010
6003

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>
24010

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

0

Comment

We do not collect data which breaks down the usage of fossil fuel, i.e., to generate steam or to produce heat. To answer C8.2c, we surveyed several manufacturing sites in different businesses to determine how fossil fuels are used. The MWh of fuel consumed for self generation of heat and the self generation of steam are based upon the survey results

C8.2d

(C8.2d) List the average emission factors of the fuels reported in C8.2c.

Bituminous Coal

Emission factor
2.4587

Unit
metric tons CO2e per metric ton

Emission factor source
World Resources Institute (2008) GHG Protocol Tool for Stationary Combustion Version 4.0

Comment

Fuel Oil Number 2

Emission factor
2.6857

Unit
kg CO2e per liter

Emission factor source
World Resources Institute (2008) GHG Protocol Tool for Stationary Combustion Version 4.0

Comment

Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)

Emission factor
1.6131

Unit
kg CO2 per liter

Emission factor source
World Resources Institute (2008) GHG Protocol Tool for Stationary Combustion Version 4.0

Comment

Natural Gas

Emission factor
1.8868

Unit
kg CO2e per m3

Emission factor source
World Resources Institute (2008) GHG Protocol Tool for Stationary Combustion Version 4.0

Comment

Residual Fuel Oil

Emission factor
2.949

Unit
kg CO2e per liter

Emission factor source
World Resources Institute (2008) GHG Protocol Tool for Stationary Combustion Version 4.0

Comment

C8.2e

(C8.2e) 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	73400	67031	222	222
Heat	68942	68942	0	0
Steam	548863	548863	0	0
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2f

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

Basis for applying a low-carbon emission factor

Colgate purchased 220000 Green-e energy certified RECs. These RECS only contain renewable attributes. These RECs are sourced from wind energy generators that are located in the United States of America in the State of Kansas. The period of generation was the first and second quarters of 2018.
0
220000
North America
Wind
Energy attribute certificates, Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs)

Low-carbon technology type
Colgate purchased 220000 Green-e energy certified RECs. These RECS only contain renewable attributes. These RECs are sourced from wind energy generators that are located in the United States of America in the State of Kansas. The period of generation was the first and second quarters of 2018.
0
220000
North America
Wind

Region of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
Colgate purchased 220000 Green-e energy certified RECs. These RECS only contain renewable attributes. These RECs are sourced from wind energy generators that are located in the United States of America in the State of Kansas. The period of generation was the first and second quarters of 2018.
0
220000
North America

MWh consumed associated with low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
Colgate purchased 220000 Green-e energy certified RECs. These RECS only contain renewable attributes. These RECs are sourced from wind energy generators that are located in the United States of America in the State of Kansas. The period of generation was the first and second quarters of 2018.
0
220000

Emission factor (in units of metric tons CO2e per MWh)
Colgate purchased 220000 Green-e energy certified RECs. These RECS only contain renewable attributes. These RECs are sourced from wind energy generators that are located in the United States of America in the State of Kansas. The period of generation was the first and second quarters of 2018.
0

Comment
Colgate purchased 220000 Green-e energy certified RECs. These RECS only contain renewable attributes. These RECs are sourced from wind energy generators that are located in the United States of America in the State of Kansas. The period of generation was the first and second quarters of 2018.

Basis for applying a low-carbon emission factor
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Mexico.
0
31
Latin America
Solar PV
Off-grid energy consumption from an on-site installation or through a direct line to an off-site generator owned by another company

Low-carbon technology type
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Mexico.
0
31
Latin America
Solar PV

Region of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Mexico.
0
31
Latin America

MWh consumed associated with low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Mexico.
0
31

Emission factor (in units of metric tons CO2e per MWh)
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Mexico.
0

Comment
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Mexico.

Basis for applying a low-carbon emission factor
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Italy
0
191
Europe
Solar PV
Off-grid energy consumption from an on-site installation or through a direct line to an off-site generator owned by another company

Low-carbon technology type
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Italy
0
191
Europe

Solar PV

Region of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Italy
0
191
Europe

MWh consumed associated with low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Italy
0
191

Emission factor (in units of metric tons CO2e per MWh)
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Italy
0

Comment
On-site solar power generation at our manufacturing site in Italy

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

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

Description
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Decreased
1.3
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Energy Consumption (MWh)
0.36
Energy usage

Metric value
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Decreased
1.3
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Energy Consumption (MWh)
0.36

Metric numerator
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Decreased
1.3
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Energy Consumption (MWh)

Metric denominator (intensity metric only)
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Decreased
1.3
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)

% change from previous year
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Decreased
1.3

Direction of change
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions. Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.
Decreased

Please explain
Our 2020 Energy Efficiency Goal is to reduce our manufacturing energy intensity (MWh/MT) by 33% from our 2002 base year and in doing so reduce our GHG emissions.

Our manufacturing intensity in the base year (2002) was 0.519 MWh/ MT and 0 .356 MWh/MT in 2018. Our 2020 goal is 0.343 MWh/MT. Through 2018, we achieved 96% of our goal to reduce manufacturing energy intensity.

Description

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Increased
6.5
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Waste to Landfill (kgs)
6.27
Waste

Metric value

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Increased
6.5
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Waste to Landfill (kgs)
6.27

Metric numerator

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Increased
6.5
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Waste to Landfill (kgs)

Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Increased
6.5
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)

% change from previous year

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Increased
6.5

Direction of change

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.
Increased

Please explain

Our 2020 goal on landfill waste is to: Halve our manufacturing waste sent to landfill per ton of product compared to 2010, working toward our goal of 'Zero Waste' and in doing so reduce the GHG emissions associated with landfilling our wastes.

Description

Increased
1.8
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Incoming Water (m3)- Water in Products (m3)
1.09
Other, please specify (Normalized Water Used to Make Product)

Metric value

Increased
1.8
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Incoming Water (m3)- Water in Products (m3)
1.09

Metric numerator

Increased
1.8
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)
Total Incoming Water (m3)- Water in Products (m3)

Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Increased
1.8
Net Manufactured for Shipment (MT)

% change from previous year

Increased
1.8

Direction of change

Increased

Please explain

C10. Verification

C10.1

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

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

C10.1a

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

Scope
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete
Annual process
Scope 1

Verification or assurance cycle in place
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf

Page/ section reference
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2

Relevant standard
95
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
95

Scope
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf

Limited assurance
Complete
Annual process
Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf

Page/ section reference
95
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2

Relevant standard
95
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
95

Scope
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete
Annual process
Scope 2 market-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL.pdf

Page/ section reference
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

C10.1b

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

Scope
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 3 Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL_6.19.2019.pdf
Complete
Annual process
Scope 3- at least one applicable category

Verification or assurance cycle in place
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 3 Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL_6.19.2019.pdf
Complete
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 3 Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL_6.19.2019.pdf
Complete

Attach the statement
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2
Colgate Scope 3 Emissions Verification 2018_FINAL_6.19.2019.pdf

Page/section reference
ISO14064-3
Pages 1 & 2

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

C10.2

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

C10.2a

(C10.2a) Which data points within your CDP disclosure have been verified, and which verification standards were used?

Disclosure module verification relates to	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
C9. Additional metrics	Other, please specify (Incoming water, well water, municipal water, other water, total energy consumption, wastes to landfill, wastes to treatment followed by disposal, waste to recycle, wastes to reuse, waste to waste to energy facilities, bulk wastewater to treatment)	International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised	Other environmental indicators were independently verified by a third party including energy consumption, incoming water and the sources of that water, e.g., municipal water supplies, ground water and quantity of wastes disposed and how these wastes were disposed. e.g, via landfill, via offsite treatment followed by disposal. https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/content/dam/cp-sites/corporate/corporate/common/pdf/sustainability/data-validation-and-assurance-statements-2018.zip colgate-assurance-statement-env-indicators.pdf

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

(C11.1) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?
No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

C11.2

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

No

C11.3

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

Yes

C11.3a

(C11.3a) Provide details of how your organization uses an internal price on carbon.

Objective for implementing an internal carbon price

In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.
Internal fee
Offsets
A number of factors are considered in assessing an investment including but not limited to the age of the equipment being replaced, needs to meet production demands, projected growth, the location of the project, utility costs, labor costs and projected cost savings. CO2 reductions are also a factor in the evaluation. Basically, differentiated pricing: a price that varies by region, business unit or type of decision
1.72
The cost of Colgate's REC purchases is charged back to Colgate's businesses in proportion to their Scope1 plus Scope 2 emissions. The cost of carbon shown below is the current cost for 22000 RECs divided by the achieved CO2 reduction in MT. Our energy reduction initiatives are part of the "5% to Planet" initiative, aiming to reduce energy, CO2, water, and waste as part of our capital investments. It is noted that the minimum financial rate of return to implement a planet project is in effect a surrogate for an internal price of carbon, i.e., $/ MT of carbon reduced. By requiring that a minimum of 5% of Colgate's capital budget be allocated to planet projects, the internal rate of return for planet projects can be less than the rate of return for other projects. Our planet projects are tracked as to their approval status, the year of implementation, the fuel and electricity savings in MWh, the CO2 reduction (MT/ year), the cost savings and project costs.
Scope 2
Change internal behavior
Drive energy efficiency
Drive low-carbon investment
Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

GHG Scope

In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.
Internal fee
Offsets
A number of factors are considered in assessing an investment including but not limited to the age of the equipment being replaced, needs to meet production demands, projected growth, the location of the project, utility costs, labor costs and projected cost savings. CO2 reductions are also a factor in the evaluation. Basically, differentiated pricing: a price that varies by region, business unit or type of decision
1.72
The cost of Colgate's REC purchases is charged back to Colgate's businesses in proportion to their Scope1 plus Scope 2 emissions. The cost of carbon shown below is the current cost for 22000 RECs divided by the achieved CO2 reduction in MT. Our energy reduction initiatives are part of the "5% to Planet" initiative, aiming to reduce energy, CO2, water, and waste as part of our capital investments. It is noted that the minimum financial rate of return to implement a planet project is in effect a surrogate for an internal price of carbon, i.e., $/ MT of carbon reduced. By requiring that a minimum of 5% of Colgate's capital budget be allocated to planet projects, the internal rate of return for planet projects can be less than the rate of return for other projects. Our planet projects are tracked as to their approval status, the year of implementation, the fuel and electricity savings in MWh, the CO2 reduction (MT/ year), the cost savings and project costs.
Scope 2

Application

In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.
Internal fee
Offsets
A number of factors are considered in assessing an investment including but not limited to the age of the equipment being replaced, needs to meet production demands, projected growth, the location of the project, utility costs, labor costs and projected cost savings. CO2 reductions are also a factor in the evaluation. Basically, differentiated pricing: a price that varies by region, business unit or type of decision
1.72
The cost of Colgate's REC purchases is charged back to Colgate's businesses in proportion to their Scope1 plus Scope 2 emissions. The cost of carbon shown below is the current cost for 22000 RECs divided by the achieved CO2 reduction in MT. Our energy reduction initiatives are part of the "5% to Planet" initiative, aiming to reduce energy, CO2, water, and waste as part of our capital investments. It is noted that the minimum financial rate of return to implement a planet project is in effect a surrogate for an internal price of carbon, i.e., $/ MT of carbon reduced. By requiring that a minimum of 5% of Colgate's capital budget be allocated to planet projects, the internal rate of return for planet projects can be less than the rate of return for other projects. Our planet projects are tracked as to their approval status, the year of implementation, the fuel and electricity savings in MWh, the CO2 reduction (MT/ year), the cost savings and project costs.

Actual price(s) used (Currency /metric ton)

In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green

power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.
Internal fee
Offsets
A number of factors are considered in assessing an investment including but not limited to the age of the equipment being replaced, needs to meet production demands, projected growth, the location of the project, utility costs, labor costs and projected cost savings. CO2 reductions are also a factor in the evaluation. Basically, differentiated pricing: a price that varies by region, business unit or type of decision
1.72

Variance of price(s) used
In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.
Internal fee
Offsets
A number of factors are considered in assessing an investment including but not limited to the age of the equipment being replaced, needs to meet production demands, projected growth, the location of the project, utility costs, labor costs and projected cost savings. CO2 reductions are also a factor in the evaluation. Basically, differentiated pricing: a price that varies by region, business unit or type of decision

Type of internal carbon price
In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.
Internal fee
Offsets

Impact & implication
In support of our 2020 Sustainability Climate goal of reducing absolute CO2 emissions from our global factories by 25%, Colgate purchases appropriate quantities of green power in the form of green-e certified US-based Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). As indicated, the cost of this green power purchase is then internally charged back to our global sites directly in proportion to their Scope 1 & 2 CO2 emissions. Although the REC costs are relatively modest compared to energy costs, we believe this sends yet another important financial signal to our sites, and further, incentivize them to consider the potential opportunities associated with reducing their carbon emissions.

C12. Engagement

C12.1

(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?
Yes, our suppliers
Yes, other partners in the value chain

C12.1a

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

Type of engagement
Number of suppliers: 109
Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.
We followed these criteria for supplier engagement: Suppliers representing approximately 80% of our total global spend, suppliers from high emitting sectors as for example manufacturers and logistics providers. Suppliers connected with our agricultural materials, where we would like to see significant emissions reductions. All our forest commodities suppliers are included in the scope as mandatory. Every year we assess the pool of suppliers selected and evaluate if we need to add any additional supplier in our engagement plan. In 2016, we updated some of our supply chain emission factors Prioritizing engagements: For CDP Supply Chain, we focus on our largest suppliers by spend level. For raw material engagement, we began engaging key suppliers of raw materials which have been determined to be our most carbon-intensive in our oral care value chain. In 2016, Colgate estimated or updated the carbon and water footprints for our Oral Care, Personal Care and Home Care categories. We are beginning to use this data to engage with our suppliers in the areas where we can have the greatest impact.
0
48
0.3
Collect climate change and carbon information at least annually from suppliers
Information collection (understanding supplier behavior)

Details of engagement
Number of suppliers: 109

Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.
We followed these criteria for supplier engagement: Suppliers representing approximately 80% of our total global spend, suppliers from high emitting sectors as for example manufacturers and logistics providers. Suppliers connected with our agricultural materials, where we would like to see significant emissions reductions. All our forest commodities suppliers are included in the scope as mandatory. Every year we assess the pool of suppliers selected and evaluate if we need to add any additional supplier in our engagement plan. In 2016, we updated some of our supply chain emission factors Prioritizing engagements: For CDP Supply Chain, we focus on our largest suppliers by spend level. For raw material engagement, we began engaging key suppliers of raw materials which have been determined to be our most carbon-intensive in our oral care value chain. In 2016, Colgate estimated or updated the carbon and water footprints for our Oral Care, Personal Care and Home Care categories. We are beginning to use this data to engage with our suppliers in the areas where we can have the greatest impact.
0
48
0.3
Collect climate change and carbon information at least annually from suppliers

% of suppliers by number

Number of suppliers: 109
Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.
We followed these criteria for supplier engagement: Suppliers representing approximately 80% of our total global spend, suppliers from high emitting sectors as for example manufacturers and logistics providers. Suppliers connected with our agricultural materials, where we would like to see significant emissions reductions. All our forest commodities suppliers are included in the scope as mandatory. Every year we assess the pool of suppliers selected and evaluate if we need to add any additional supplier in our engagement plan. In 2016, we updated some of our supply chain emission factors Prioritizing engagements: For CDP Supply Chain, we focus on our largest suppliers by spend level. For raw material engagement, we began engaging key suppliers of raw materials which have been determined to be our most carbon-intensive in our oral care value chain. In 2016, Colgate estimated or updated the carbon and water footprints for our Oral Care, Personal Care and Home Care categories. We are beginning to use this data to engage with our suppliers in the areas where we can have the greatest impact.
0
48
0.3

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

Number of suppliers: 109
Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.
We followed these criteria for supplier engagement: Suppliers representing approximately 80% of our total global spend, suppliers from high emitting sectors as for example manufacturers and logistics providers. Suppliers connected with our agricultural materials, where we would like to see significant emissions reductions. All our forest commodities suppliers are included in the scope as mandatory. Every year we assess the pool of suppliers selected and evaluate if we need to add any additional supplier in our engagement plan. In 2016, we updated some of our supply chain emission factors Prioritizing engagements: For CDP Supply Chain, we focus on our largest suppliers by spend level. For raw material engagement, we began engaging key suppliers of raw materials which have been determined to be our most carbon-intensive in our oral care value chain. In 2016, Colgate estimated or updated the carbon and water footprints for our Oral Care, Personal Care and Home Care categories. We are beginning to use this data to engage with our suppliers in the areas where we can have the greatest impact.
0
48

% Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5

Number of suppliers: 109
Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began

estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.
We followed these criteria for supplier engagement: Suppliers representing approximately 80% of our total global spend, suppliers from high emitting sectors as for example manufacturers and logistics providers. Suppliers connected with our agricultural materials, where we would like to see significant emissions reductions. All our forest commodities suppliers are included in the scope as mandatory. Every year we assess the pool of suppliers selected and evaluate if we need to add any additional supplier in our engagement plan. In 2016, we updated some of our supply chain emission factors Prioritizing engagements: For CDP Supply Chain, we focus on our largest suppliers by spend level. For raw material engagement, we began engaging key suppliers of raw materials which have been determined to be our most carbon-intensive in our oral care value chain. In 2016, Colgate estimated or updated the carbon and water footprints for our Oral Care, Personal Care and Home Care categories. We are beginning to use this data to engage with our suppliers in the areas where we can have the greatest impact.
0

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Number of suppliers: 109
Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.
We followed these criteria for supplier engagement: Suppliers representing approximately 80% of our total global spend, suppliers from high emitting sectors as for example manufacturers and logistics providers. Suppliers connected with our agricultural materials, where we would like to see significant emissions reductions. All our forest commodities suppliers are included in the scope as mandatory. Every year we assess the pool of suppliers selected and evaluate if we need to add any additional supplier in our engagement plan. In 2016, we updated some of our supply chain emission factors Prioritizing engagements: For CDP Supply Chain, we focus on our largest suppliers by spend level. For raw material engagement, we began engaging key suppliers of raw materials which have been determined to be our most carbon-intensive in our oral care value chain. In 2016, Colgate estimated or updated the carbon and water footprints for our Oral Care, Personal Care and Home Care categories. We are beginning to use this data to engage with our suppliers in the areas where we can have the greatest impact.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

Number of suppliers: 109
Measure of success: Numbers are for CDP Supply Chain program in 2018. We request that our key Tier I suppliers and suppliers of carbon-intensive materials participate in the CDP Supply Chain Program Climate Disclosure to help us understand and address climate impacts and associated risks and opportunities in our upstream supply chain. In 2018, more than 46% of our Tier I suppliers responded to the survey, including our largest raw material suppliers and contract manufacturers. We achieved a 83% supplier response rate, significantly higher than the average rate for all member companies. Method of engagement: We have participated in CDP's Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration Project since 2008, increasing the scope of suppliers each year. This program helps Colgate gather data to obtain a better understanding of our environmental footprint. In 2012, Colgate worked with a consultant to develop a comprehensive "top down" carbon footprint for our global Oral Care value chain. The footprint focused on the 15 categories of Scope 3 emissions outlined by the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol, with the goal of identifying the most relevant Scope 3 areas, CO2 "hotspots" and potential areas of improvement. This exercise utilized a complete year's data (e.g. procurement, logistics, manufacturing, travel, consumer use, disposal, etc.) to convert those activities to Scope 3 emissions estimates. In 2013, we expanded the Carbon Footprint project by conducting a "deeper dive" into the Scope 3 category of Purchased Goods and Services. We began engaging key raw materials suppliers based on these results, to look for opportunities and reduce CO2. In 2014, we began estimating the CO2 impact of various formulation and procurement scenarios. In 2015, we expanded the work to our Personal Care and Home Care categories.

Comment

Number of suppliers: 109

C12.1c

(C12.1c) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with other partners in the value chain.

Other - Logistics partners:

Methods of engagement: In the logistics area (category #4 Upstream Transportation & Distribution), Colgate works closely with its third party logistics providers on a number of climate related initiatives including: use of natural gas instead of diesel to fuel the transport vehicles; the use of collaborative shipping where products from Colgate and other companies that are going to the same customer are combined to produce fully loaded vehicles; encouraging the use of energy efficient lighting in the warehouses owned by third party logistics providers; working with customers to promote the environmental benefits intermodal shipments (rail). Additionally, Colgate is a member of the EPA Smartway program, a market-driven partnership aimed at helping businesses move goods in the cleanest, most efficient way possible.

Prioritizing engagements: Colgate focuses its efforts on our key strategic larger-scale providers, as Colgate has the greatest potential to initiate change and drive transformation with its principal provider.

Measures of success: Colgate has developed a scorecard to measure its success on conversion to natural gas. The scorecard measures tons shipped, distance, origin and destination for natural gas shipments. Additionally, Colgate measures success by our reduction in logistics emissions - for example, our North America region has reduced logistics greenhouse gas emissions by 27 percent per ton of finished goods moved since 2010.

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?

Trade associations
Funding research organizations
Other

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

Colgate's VP of Global Sustainability, EHS and Supply Chain Strategy is a member of the CGF Sustainability Steering Committee and actively participates in decision-making on climate change and formulation of CGF strategies. Colgate's Executive Chairman, Ian Cook is Co-Chair of the Board of the CGF and actively participates in sustainability-related decision-making. Colgate also contributed to a booklet for the May 2015 Business & Climate Summit in Paris, highlighting our commitment to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius and our energy reduction efforts. The summit was "designed to showcase how business is now ready to play its role in meeting the climate challenge."
CGF states publicly 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. In 2016, the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) updated its resolution on refrigerants, which calls on Food and Beverage supply chains to phase out hydrofluorocarbons. Although Colgate is not in the Food and Beverage sector, we have proactively aligned our global refrigerant standard to meet the intent of the CGF's resolution as a way to support these efforts. In addition, we developed an associated e-learning training tool to assist our global facilities in transitioning toward less carbon-intensive refrigerants. CGF also has a resolution to help mobilize resources to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020. (CGF additionally is working towards a resolution to address food waste, which Colgate does not generate).
Consistent
Consumer Goods Forum

Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Colgate's VP of Global Sustainability, EHS and Supply Chain Strategy is a member of the CGF Sustainability Steering Committee and actively participates in decision-making on climate change and formulation of CGF strategies. Colgate's Executive Chairman, Ian Cook is Co-Chair of the Board of the CGF and actively participates in sustainability-related decision-making. Colgate also contributed to a booklet for the May 2015 Business & Climate Summit in Paris, highlighting our commitment to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius and our energy reduction efforts. The summit was "designed to showcase how business is now ready to play its role in meeting the climate challenge."
CGF states publicly 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. In 2016, the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) updated its resolution on refrigerants, which calls on Food and Beverage supply chains to phase out hydrofluorocarbons. Although Colgate is not in the Food and Beverage sector, we have proactively aligned our global refrigerant standard to meet the intent of the CGF's resolution as a way to support these efforts. In addition, we developed an associated e-learning training tool to assist our global facilities in transitioning toward less carbon-intensive refrigerants. CGF also has a resolution to help mobilize resources to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020. (CGF additionally is working towards a resolution to address food waste, which Colgate does not generate).
Consistent

Please explain the trade association's position

Colgate's VP of Global Sustainability, EHS and Supply Chain Strategy is a member of the CGF Sustainability Steering Committee and actively participates in decision-making on climate change and formulation of CGF strategies. Colgate's Executive Chairman, Ian Cook is Co-Chair of the Board of the CGF and actively participates in sustainability-related decision-making. Colgate also contributed to a booklet for the May 2015 Business & Climate Summit in Paris, highlighting our commitment to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius and our energy reduction efforts. The summit was "designed to showcase how business is now ready to play its role in meeting the climate challenge."
CGF states publicly 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. In 2016, the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) updated its resolution on refrigerants, which calls on Food and Beverage supply chains to phase out hydrofluorocarbons. Although Colgate is not in the Food and Beverage sector, we have proactively aligned our global refrigerant standard to meet the intent of the CGF's resolution as a way to support these efforts. In addition, we developed an associated e-learning training tool to assist our global facilities in transitioning toward less carbon-intensive refrigerants. CGF also has a resolution to help mobilize resources to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020. (CGF additionally is working towards a resolution to address food waste, which Colgate does not generate).

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

Colgate's VP of Global Sustainability, EHS and Supply Chain Strategy is a member of the CGF Sustainability Steering Committee and actively participates in decision-making on climate change and formulation of CGF strategies. Colgate's Executive Chairman, Ian Cook is Co-Chair of the Board of the CGF and actively participates in sustainability-related decision-making. Colgate also contributed to a booklet for the May 2015 Business & Climate Summit in Paris, highlighting our commitment to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius and our energy reduction efforts. The summit was "designed to showcase how business is now ready to play its role in meeting the climate challenge."

Trade association

Colgate is on the Board of the A.I.S.E. We participate actively in decision making and have signed on to their Charter for Sustainable Cleaning.
A.I.S.E. is involved in various EU efforts relating to the Europe 2020 strategy on smart, sustainable and inclusive growth:- A.I.S.E. is engaged with the European Commission's Resource Efficiency Roadmap, which includes climate change milestones. - A.I.S.E. has been selected to conduct one of 14 pilot studies to test how an environmental footprint for products and organisations could work for the liquid laundry detergents sector.- A.I.S.E. joined the "world you like with a climate you like" campaign led by DG Climate. This "I prefer 30°" multi-stakeholder campaign promotes low temperature washing.
Consistent
AISE - International Assoc. for Soaps, Detergents and Maintenance Products

Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Colgate is on the Board of the A.I.S.E. We participate actively in decision making and have signed on to their Charter for Sustainable Cleaning.
A.I.S.E. is involved in various EU efforts relating to the Europe 2020 strategy on smart, sustainable and inclusive growth:- A.I.S.E. is engaged with the European Commission's Resource Efficiency Roadmap, which includes climate change milestones. - A.I.S.E. has been selected to conduct one of 14 pilot studies to test how an environmental footprint for products and organisations could work for the liquid laundry detergents sector.- A.I.S.E. joined the "world you like with a climate you like" campaign led by DG Climate. This "I prefer 30°" multi-stakeholder campaign promotes low temperature washing.
Consistent

Please explain the trade association's position

Colgate is on the Board of the A.I.S.E. We participate actively in decision making and have signed on to their Charter for Sustainable Cleaning.
A.I.S.E. is involved in various EU efforts relating to the Europe 2020 strategy on smart, sustainable and inclusive growth:- A.I.S.E. is engaged with the European Commission's Resource Efficiency Roadmap, which includes climate change milestones. - A.I.S.E. has been selected to conduct one of 14 pilot studies to test how an environmental footprint for products and organisations could work for the liquid laundry detergents sector.- A.I.S.E. joined the "world you like with a climate you like" campaign led by DG Climate. This "I prefer 30°" multi-stakeholder campaign promotes low temperature washing.

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

Colgate is on the Board of the A.I.S.E. We participate actively in decision making and have signed on to their Charter for Sustainable Cleaning.

C12.3d

(C12.3d) Do you publicly disclose a list of all research organizations that you fund?

No

C12.3e

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

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR: Colgate is an Energy Star Partner Company in the EPA's industrial sector, furthering emissions reduction in manufacturing and targeting energy efficiency and carbon footprint.We strive to achieve Energy Star Partner status and have enrolled all Colgate manufacturing sites globally in the USEPA Energy Star Challenge for Industry. We were named an Energy Star Partner of the Year several years in a row (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018) and 83% of our sites have achieved ENERGY STAR Challenge for Industry status. We have sponsored Energy Star events with our suppliers to increase awareness and engagement.

USGBC: Colgate is an active member of the U.S. Green Building Council, committed to a sustainable future through cost-efficient and energy-saving green buildings. We have 19 facilities around the world which have achieved 26 Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certifications, with one more projects registered and underway; and we've committed to LEED for all new construction. Colgate is a Charter Member of the USGBC LEED User Group: Industrial Facilities. We review proposed Standards and discuss real world practicalities regarding design in the construction of facilities globally and contributed to the development of a tool to share LEED certified building details. Our Director, Environmental Sustainability, Global Supply Chain is on the Board of USGBC's New Jersey chapter.

The Sustainability Consortium (TSC): Colgate is an active member of The Sustainability Consortium and sits on the Corporate Advisory Council. We contribute to the development of key metrics to measure sustainability efforts, a crucial first step for product sustainability and emissions reductions over the product lifecycle. We are working with TSC to develop a standardized framework for the communication of sustainability-related product information. The framework enables rigorous product level Life Cycle Assessments to be done at a fraction of today's time and cost. Colgate contributes to the development of a standardized framework for the communication of sustainability-related information throughout the product sustainability value chain downstream to consumers.

Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO): Colgate is an RSPO member company, contributing to the development of standards in conjunction with government and owners to ensure palm oil is grown and harvested in a sustainable manner. In June 2015, Colgate also signed a letter, together with other companies and investors, urging the RSPO to strengthen its standards and practices to reflect best practices widely recognized as necessary to ensure palm oil is produced in a manner that does not degrade the environment or result in violations of human rights. Colgate's Policy on No Deforestation details further commitments to sourcing sustainable palm oil and other forest commodities. Additionally, in July 2016, we have Issued a commodity-specific Policy on Responsible and Sustainable Sourcing of Palm Oils. We continue to support a moratorium on further deforestation by palm oil producers and have communicated that position to our suppliers who have direct contact with the producers.

We Mean Business: Colgate made public commitment to climate-related initiative and committed to adopt a science-based emissions reduction target and remove commodity-driven deforestation from all supply chains through the We Mean Business Take Action Platform, demonstrating support for a low-carbon economy.

United Nations: In May 2017, Colgate became a member of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC). Colgate supports the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In our 2018 CSR report, we describe how our initiatives can be linked to specific UN SDGs. Colgate is working with the UNGC to leverage the SDGs in the ongoing development of our climate stewardship and sustainability strategies. Additionally, in 2018, we joined the UNGC Action Platform on climate-related Pathways to Low-Carbon and Resilient Development.

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?

Through active participation and engagement, managed by a central Colgate team, with various external stakeholder groups (e.g. USEPA, TSC, ACI, AISE, USGBC, WRI, UNGC), as well as engagement with our internal stakeholders, we work to ensure our direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with our overall climate strategy. We believe our commitment and performance demonstrate business support for climate. Global Sustainability and EHS is also consulted in the event of proposed policy engagement of relevance to climate change. Additionally, Colgate manages multiple engagement activities around climate change across business divisions/categories and geographies by including Climate Change Strategies and commitments in our Global Sustainability Strategy. These commitments are cascaded into Division specific Sustainability Plans and goals. Function specific strategies and goals are coordinated at the global level and are also included in Global Growth and Efficiency, Global Technology and Global Supply Chain strategic plans. Progress on our climate change commitments and KPIs are reported on twice a year on an organization wide as part of our Environmental Performance and Sustainability progress report and our New Products Sustainability progress report.Many strategies are led globally. Global manufacturing drives 5% for the Planet capital investment program, engagement in USEPA Energy Star Challenge for Industry, achievement of manufacturing energy and carbon reduction goals, Business Readiness Planning, and LEED NC certification for all new manufacturing plants. Global logistics drives carbon reduction relating to movement of finished goods through network optimization, low carbon transportation and efficient load building. Our marketing team leads development of consumer engagement campaigns to reduce water/energy associated with use of our products, often with support of our Global Sustainability and EHS team. Clarity of purpose, inclusion in our goal alignment process and regular progress reporting drives alignment.

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

Link to the report: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/node/35226/html Climate change has been described in Colgate's risk factors, addressing the potential impacts of this risk on our reputation and business.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
p.10, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Disruption in our global supply chain or key office facilities could adversely impact our business. p.14, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Climate change may have an adverse impact on our business and results of operations.
Colgate_Palmolive_2018_10K.pdf
Complete
In mainstream reports

Status

Link to the report: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/node/35226/html Climate change has been described in Colgate's risk factors, addressing the potential impacts of this risk on our reputation and business.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
p.10, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Disruption in our global supply chain or key office facilities could adversely impact our business. p.14, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Climate change may have an adverse impact on our business and results of operations.
Colgate_Palmolive_2018_10K.pdf
Complete

Attach the document

Link to the report: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/node/35226/html Climate change has been described in Colgate's risk factors, addressing the potential impacts of this risk on our reputation and business.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
p.10, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Disruption in our global supply chain or key office facilities could adversely impact our business. p.14, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Climate change may have an adverse impact on our business and results of operations.
Colgate_Palmolive_2018_10K.pdf

Page/Section reference

Link to the report: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/node/35226/html Climate change has been described in Colgate's risk factors, addressing the potential impacts of this risk on our reputation and business.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
p.10, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Disruption in our global supply chain or key office facilities could adversely impact our business. p.14, Item 1A - Risk Factors: Climate change may have an adverse impact on our business and results of operations.

Content elements

Link to the report: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/node/35226/html Climate change has been described in Colgate's risk factors, addressing the potential impacts of this risk on our reputation and business.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities

Comment

Link to the report: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/node/35226/html Climate change has been described in Colgate's risk factors, addressing the potential impacts of this risk on our reputation and business.

Publication

The Sustainability section of the Annual Report provides figures regarding the strategy to achieve our climate goals and improvements to meet our commitments, the amount of MWh of renewable energy credits, numbers of Energy Star awards achieved, amount of water saved through the Save Water campaign, which leads to Scope-3 GHG emission reductions and several other metrics that contribute to the overall sustainability of Colgate. The Full report can be accessed through this link: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/static-files/8856158d-04ae-4770-a979-dbdf4db2559b
Strategy
Emissions figures
Other metrics
Page 7 of the 2018 Annual Report of Colgate Palmolive
Annual Report Sustainability Page.pdf
Complete
In mainstream reports

Status

The Sustainability section of the Annual Report provides figures regarding the strategy to achieve our climate goals and improvements to meet our commitments, the amount of MWh of renewable energy credits, numbers of Energy Star awards achieved, amount of water saved through the Save Water campaign, which leads to Scope-3 GHG emission reductions and several other metrics that contribute to the overall sustainability of Colgate. The Full report can be accessed through this link: https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/static-files/8856158d-04ae-4770-a979-dbdf4db2559b
Strategy
Emissions figures
Other metrics
Page 7 of the 2018 Annual Report of Colgate Palmolive
Annual Report Sustainability Page.pdf
Complete

Attach the document

The Sustainability section of the Annual Report provides figures regarding the strategy to achieve our climate goals and improvements to meet our commitments, the amount of MWh of renewable energy credits, numbers of Energy Star awards achieved, amount of water saved through the Save Water campaign, which leads to Scope-3 GHG emission reductions and several other metrics that contribute to the overall sustainability of Colgate. The Full report can be accessed through this link:

https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/static-files/8856158d-04ae-4770-a979-dbdf4db2559b
Strategy
Emissions figures
Other metrics
Page 7 of the 2018 Annual Report of Colgate Palmolive
Annual Report Sustainability Page.pdf

Page/Section reference
The Sustainability section of the Annual Report provides figures regarding the strategy to achieve our climate goals and improvements to meet our commitments, the amount of MWh of renewable energy credits, numbers of Energy Star awards achieved, amount of water saved through the Save Water campaign, which leads to Scope-3 GHG emission reductions and several other metrics that contribute to the overall sustainability of Colgate. The Full report can be accessed through this link:
https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/static-files/8856158d-04ae-4770-a979-dbdf4db2559b
Strategy
Emissions figures
Other metrics
Page 7 of the 2018 Annual Report of Colgate Palmolive

Content elements
The Sustainability section of the Annual Report provides figures regarding the strategy to achieve our climate goals and improvements to meet our commitments, the amount of MWh of renewable energy credits, numbers of Energy Star awards achieved, amount of water saved through the Save Water campaign, which leads to Scope-3 GHG emission reductions and several other metrics that contribute to the overall sustainability of Colgate. The Full report can be accessed through this link:
https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/static-files/8856158d-04ae-4770-a979-dbdf4db2559b
Strategy
Emissions figures
Other metrics

Comment
The Sustainability section of the Annual Report provides figures regarding the strategy to achieve our climate goals and improvements to meet our commitments, the amount of MWh of renewable energy credits, numbers of Energy Star awards achieved, amount of water saved through the Save Water campaign, which leads to Scope-3 GHG emission reductions and several other metrics that contribute to the overall sustainability of Colgate. The Full report can be accessed through this link:
https://investor.colgatepalmolive.com/static-files/8856158d-04ae-4770-a979-dbdf4db2559b

---

Publication
Colgate's 2018 Sustainability Report has been published in the website format and the link is available: https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/en-us/core-values/sustainability Attached document is a PDF version of the "planet" section of our report saved from the website. While we have a "Climate" section in our report, dedicated to describe our governance of climate risks, strategies to implement policies, targets and progress towards targets, our Sustainability Report has also many other sections related to water, waste, no-deforestation, environmental management, sustainable buildings and consumer waste, which are all related to reducing the GHG footprint of our business and help create a better world.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics
All pages
Colgate-Palmolive Sustainability Planet Commitments - https___www.colgatepalmolive.com_en-us_core-values_sustainability_planet.pdf
Complete
In voluntary sustainability report

Status
Colgate's 2018 Sustainability Report has been published in the website format and the link is available: https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/en-us/core-values/sustainability Attached document is a PDF version of the "planet" section of our report saved from the website. While we have a "Climate" section in our report, dedicated to describe our governance of climate risks, strategies to implement policies, targets and progress towards targets, our Sustainability Report has also many other sections related to water, waste, no-deforestation, environmental management, sustainable buildings and consumer waste, which are all related to reducing the GHG footprint of our business and help create a better world.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics
All pages
Colgate-Palmolive Sustainability Planet Commitments - https___www.colgatepalmolive.com_en-us_core-values_sustainability_planet.pdf
Complete

Attach the document
Colgate's 2018 Sustainability Report has been published in the website format and the link is available: https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/en-us/core-values/sustainability Attached document is a PDF version of the "planet" section of our report saved from the website. While we have a "Climate" section in our report, dedicated to describe our governance of climate risks, strategies to implement policies, targets and progress towards targets, our Sustainability Report has also many other sections related to water, waste, no-deforestation, environmental management, sustainable buildings and consumer waste, which are all related to reducing the GHG footprint of our business and help create a better world.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics
All pages
Colgate-Palmolive Sustainability Planet Commitments - https___www.colgatepalmolive.com_en-us_core-values_sustainability_planet.pdf

Page/Section reference
Colgate's 2018 Sustainability Report has been published in the website format and the link is available: https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/en-us/core-values/sustainability Attached document is a PDF version of the "planet" section of our report saved from the website. While we have a "Climate" section in our report, dedicated to describe our

governance of climate risks, strategies to implement policies, targets and progress towards targets, our Sustainability Report has also many other sections related to water, waste, no-deforestation, environmental management, sustainable buildings and consumer waste, which are all related to reducing the GHG footprint of our business and help create a better world.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics
All pages

Content elements

Colgate's 2018 Sustainability Report has been published in the website format and the link is available: https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/en-us/core-values/sustainability Attached document is a PDF version of the "planet" section of our report saved from the website. While we have a "Climate" section in our report, dedicated to describe our governance of climate risks, strategies to implement policies, targets and progress towards targets, our Sustainability Report has also many other sections related to water, waste, no-deforestation, environmental management, sustainable buildings and consumer waste, which are all related to reducing the GHG footprint of our business and help create a better world.
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

Colgate's 2018 Sustainability Report has been published in the website format and the link is available: https://www.colgatepalmolive.com/en-us/core-values/sustainability Attached document is a PDF version of the "planet" section of our report saved from the website. While we have a "Climate" section in our report, dedicated to describe our governance of climate risks, strategies to implement policies, targets and progress towards targets, our Sustainability Report has also many other sections related to water, waste, no-deforestation, environmental management, sustainable buildings and consumer waste, which are all related to reducing the GHG footprint of our business and help create a better world.

C14. 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.

C14.1

(C14.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

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

SC. Supply chain module

SC0.0

(SC0.0) If you would like to do so, please provide a separate introduction to this module.

SC0.1

(SC0.1) What is your company's annual revenue for the stated reporting period?

	Annual Revenue
Row 1	15500000000

SC0.2

(SC0.2) Do you have an ISIN for your company that you would be willing to share with CDP?
Yes

SC0.2a

(SC0.2a) Please use the table below to share your ISIN.

	ISIN country code (2 letters)	ISIN numeric identifier and single check digit (10 numbers overall)
Row 1	US	1941621039

SC1.1

(SC1.1) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

SC1.2

(SC1.2) Where published information has been used in completing SC1.1, please provide a reference(s).

SC1.3

(SC1.3) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Allocation challenges	Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges
Other, please specify (Supply chain is complex)	Supply chain is complex and emissions are not allocated to unique customers at the technical level. Given the complexity of the supply chain, a decision was made to allocate greenhouse gas emissions based on revenue. This is not a calculation of the specific emissions and sources attributable to our customers.

SC1.4

(SC1.4) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?
Yes

SC1.4a

(SC1.4a) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities.

We will continue to allocate based on revenue and expand the number of retailers to which this information is supplied, upon request.

SC2.1

(SC2.1) Please propose any mutually beneficial climate-related projects you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

SC2.2

(SC2.2) Have requests or initiatives by CDP Supply Chain members prompted your organization to take organizational-level emissions reduction initiatives?
Please select

SC3.1

(SC3.1) Do you want to enroll in the 2019-2020 CDP Action Exchange initiative?
No

SC3.2

(SC3.2) Is your company a participating supplier in CDP's 2018-2019 Action Exchange initiative?
No

SC4.1

(SC4.1) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Please select

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

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

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms