

Nestlé

Coalition member since 2020 | As of September 2022, palm oil, direct soy, embedded soy, and paper, pulp, and fibre-based packaging (PPP), and beef are material commodities for Nestlé.

The following table includes a list of each Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for each material commodity, along with the company's 2021 and 2022 reporting record. The record includes the following responses:

- "Yes" indicates a company is reporting against a KPI and reporting quantitively where indicated
- "Yes narrative reporting" indicates a company is reporting qualitatively against a quantitative KPI
- "Not reporting yet" response indicates a company is not reporting on a KPI
- "N/A" indicates a KPI was not established in a given year

Companies have also provided information on their performance against appropriate KPIs, along with methodologies and targets. This information has been self-reported by companies and verified by Proforest.

Links are provided to information when a company is reporting ("Yes") against a public information requirement, and when a company is reporting qualitatively ("Yes – narrative reporting") against a quantitative KPI.

For a full methodology on the Forest Positive Coalition's reporting process, including a list of all KPIs and public information requirements, visit transparency.tcgfforestpositive.com.



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
Palm Oil				
Element 1 (Own Supply) Key Per	formance Indicators for Manufactu	irers		
1.1 Policy commitments to the forest positive (or NDPE) goals	Yes	Yes		
1.2 Timebound action plan summary	Yes	Yes		
1.3 Mill list using the conventions of the Universal Mill List to make group links	Yes	Yes		
1.4 Progress of mills toward	Yes	Yes		
forest positive (or NDPE)	70% of our palm oil volumes were assessed as deforestation- free.	 80% of our supply base was coming from mills and refineries with time bound action plans towards NDPE compliance, or coming from RSPO-certified origins. 91% of our palm oil volumes were assessed as deforestation-free through one of the following verification methods: 83% assessed from the sky 6% assessed on the ground 1% traceable to low- risk origin 	<u>Click here</u>	
1.5 Percentage traceable to mill	Yes	Yes		
	96%	97%	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
1.6 Percentage traceable to FFB	Yes	Yes		
sources	70% traceability to plantation (TTP)	68%	Methodology not available	
1.7 Percentage physically	Yes	Yes		
certified (MB/SG)	 60.3% of our 2020 palm oil volumes are RSPO certified with the following chains of custody: Segregated: 21.41% Identity Preserved: 3.69% Book & Claim Credits: 35.3% 	 71% of our 2021 palm oil volumes were RSPO certified with the following chains of custody: Segregated: 19.68% Mass balance: 1.09% Credits: 50% 	Methodology not available	
	Key Performance Indicators for N	lanufacturers		
2.1 Direct supplier list	Yes	Yes		
2.2 Percentage of direct suppliers engaged and	Yes	Yes		
informed of the Forest Positive Suppliers' Commitment and Forest Positive Approach	99% of volumes come from suppliers we engaged with on our no deforestation requirements	100% of our direct suppliers have been informed and engaged about our no deforestation requirements	Methodology not available	
2.3 Performance of direct suppliers against the elements of the Forest Positive Approach and changes over time including progress on delivery across entire palm oil business	Yes – narrative reporting	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
Element 3 (Monitoring and Respo	onse) Key Performance Indicators	for Manufacturers	·	
3.1 Summary of company grievance process that aligns with Coalition Deforestation Monitoring and Response Framework (MRF)	Yes	Yes		
3.2 Summary of progress of grievance cases [e.g. in grievance log or relevant progress report(s)]	N/A	Yes		
3.3 Coverage of deforestation		Yes	<u>Click here</u>	
and peat monitoring: percentage of supply base covered by deforestation and peat monitoring (including supplier and landscape monitoring systems) aligned with Monitoring Minimum Requirements	N/A	97% of our supply base is covered by deforestation and peat monitoring aligned with CGF Forest Positive Monitoring Minimum Requirements		
3.4 Coverage of deforestation and peat monitoring: For Coalition member companies involved, narrative summary of support provided to develop on the ground monitoring and response systems beyond own supply chains including landscape initiatives and sectoral collaborations	N/A	Yes		



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
3.5 Progress towards tackling deforestation and peat grievances: Percentage of supply mills with, or potentially linked to, deforestation and peat grievances	N/A	Yes – narrative reporting 9% of our volumes have not yet been assessed as deforestation- free	Methodology not available	
3.6 Progress towards tackling deforestation and peat grievances: Percentage of deforestation and peat grievances where action taken in line with MRF steps and requirements	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	
Direct Soy				
1.1 Policy commitments to the forest positive goals	formance Indicators for Manufactu Yes	Yes		
1.2 Timebound action plan summary	Yes	Yes		
1.3 Percentage with known	Yes	Yes		
origin	96%	98% has been assessed as deforestation and conversion (DCF) free	Methodology not available	
1.4 Percentage from high-risk	Yes	Yes		
origins or unknown origins	 19%: 10% is unknow: not traced or being traced but not yet assessed as deforestation- free. 9% is coming from high risk origins and assessed on the ground as deforestation- free 	 20% including: 2% is unknown: not traced or being traced and not yet assessed as deforestation- free. 18% is coming from high- risk origins and assessed on the ground as deforestation-free 	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
1.5 Progress on ensuring soy is conversion-free for high-risk origins	Yes			
ongins	7% traced to high risk origins not yet assessed DCF but covered through RTRS regional credits	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	
1.6 Percentage DCF supply from	Yes	Yes		
high-risk areas	9% of volume in scope mapped to high risk areas was confirmed DCF	18%	<u>Click here</u>	
Element 2 (Suppliers/Traders) Ke	y Performance Indicators for Man	ufacturers		
2.1 Direct supplier list	Yes	Yes		
2.2 Summary of Forest Positive Approach for suppliers and traders	No	Yes		
2.3 Percentage of Tier 1 suppliers to whom the Forest Positive Approach and its implementation have been communicated	Yes – narrative reporting	Yes Nestlé Tier 1 suppliers assessed comprise 24% of Nestlé's 2021 volumes. In addition, these suppliers have also been engaged collectively or individually to communicate the Forest Positive Approach and its implementation	Methodology not available	
2.4 Performance of Tier 1 suppliers against Forest Positive Approach including progress on delivery across entire operations	Yes – narrative reporting	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	

Version 1.0 | Last updated 22nd September 2022 | 6



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
Embedded Soy			·	
Element 1 (Own Supply) Key Perf	ormance Indicators for Manufact	urers		
1.1 Policy commitments to the forest positive goals	Yes	Not reporting yet		
1.2 Timebound action plan summary	Yes	Not reporting yet		
1.3 Percentage with known origin	Not reporting yet	Yes – narrative reporting	Methodology not available	
1.4 Percentage from high-risk	Yes – narrative	Yes		
origins or unknown origins		32% (326,176.57 MT) of the soybean equivalent volume was exposed to high-risk origins in priority countries (Brazil, Argentina, and Paraguay)	Methodology not available	
1.5 Progress on ensuring soy is conversion-free for high-risk origins	Yes - narrative	Yes – narrative reporting	Methodology not available	
1.6 Percentage DCF supply from high-risk areas	Not reporting yet	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	
1.7 Soy footprint across all product categories	Not reporting yet	Yes	<u>Click here</u>	
1.8 Methodology for soy footprint calculation	Not reporting yet	Yes		
Element 2 (Suppliers and Traders) Key Performance Indicators for I	Manufacturers		
2.2 Summary of Forest Positive Approach for suppliers and traders	Not reporting yet	Yes		
2.3 Percentage of Tier 1 suppliers to whom the Forest Positive Approach and its implementation have been communicated	Not reporting yet	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
2.4 Performance of Tier 1 suppliers against Forest Positive Approach including progress on delivery across entire operations	N/A	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	
2.5 List of identified major upstream suppliers	Not reporting yet	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	
2.6 Upstream suppliers/traders sourcing from high-risk origins that have been engaged (directly or via collective approach) and are being evaluated	Not reporting yet	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	
2.7 Performance of upstream suppliers/traders against the elements of the Forest Positive Approach including progress on delivery across entire soy business	Not reporting yet	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	
Paper, Pulp, and Fibre-based Pack				
	ormance Indicators for Manufactu	rers and Retailers	1	1
1.1 PPP Sourcing Policy including commitment to the forest positive goals	Yes	Yes		
1.2 Timebound action plan summary	Yes	Yes		
1.3 Percentage recycled,	Yes	Yes		
percentage virgin fibre	<i>Recovered fibre: 55.4%</i><i>Virgin fibre: 44.6%</i>	<i>Recovered fibre: 56.8%</i><i>Virgin fibre: 43.2%</i>	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
1.4 Percentage of virgin supply certified, and percentage per scheme and chain of custody model	Yes 24% certified. Breakdown: • FSC FM 7.62% • FSC CW 12.14% • PEFC FM & CS: 0.15%	Yes 35.4% of our virgin fibre supply was certified with the following certification schemes and chain of custody: • FSC FM: 32.6% • FSC CW: 12.7%	Methodology not available	
1.5 Percentage of supply from high-priority sources	Yes • 6% of supply volume comes from high-risk origin that have not been traced to origin or being traced but not yet deforestation-free; • 4% of supply volume comes from high-risk origin that have been assessed deforestation-free	PEFC FM & CS: 0.1% Yes 2% of our pulp & paper volumes have not been assessed as deforestation-free or have not been traced back to country of harvest. As such, they can considered as at risk of deforestation	Methodology not available	
1.6 Actions being taken for supply from high-priority sources	Yes Supplier engagement, development of time bound action plans, project implementation	<u>Yes</u> Supplier engagement, development of time bound action plans, project implementation		
	s) Key Performance Indicators for I	Manufacturers and Retailers		
2.1 Proportion of suppliers informed about the Forest Positive Suppliers Approach	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Individual one-on-one meetings with some of suppliers	
2.2 Number or proportion of suppliers identified as priority for engagement, and percentage engaged	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
2.3 Performance of engaged suppliers and changes over time including progress on delivery across entire business	N/A	Not reporting yet	Methodology not available	
Beef				
Element 1 (Own Supply) Key Perfe	ormance Indicators for Manufactu	urers and Retailers		
1.1 Policy commitments to the forest positive goals	N/A	Yes		
1.2 Timebound action plan summary	N/A	Yes		
1.3 Beef footprint across all product categories	N/A	No	Methodology not available	
1.4 Percentage with known		Yes	Desktop assessment, country of	
origin	N/A	99%	origin for in-scope meat products	
1.5 Progress on ensuring beef is free from deforestation, conversion and conflict for high-risk areas	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	
Element 2 (Suppliers and Traders)	Key Performance Indicators for I	Manufacturers and Retailers		
2.1 Direct supplier list of identified major upstream suppliers, up to slaughterhouse when possible	N/A	Yes	Methodology not available	
2.2 A summary of the Forest Positive Approach for meatpackers and own brand manufacturers	N/A	Yes		
2.3 Tier 1 suppliers to whom the Forest Positive Approach and its implementation have been communicated	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	



КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
2.4 Performance of Tier 1 suppliers against Forest Positive Approach including progress on delivery across entire operations	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	
2.5 Meatpackers sourcing from high-risk origins that have been engaged and are being evaluated	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	
2.6 Performance of meatpackers against Forest Positive Approach including progress on delivery across entire operations	N/A	<u>Yes – narrative reporting</u>	Methodology not available	



Element 4 (Landscape Engagement) Key Performance Indicators | As of September 2022, Nestlé is focusing its landscape engagement on palm oil, soy, and PPP

КРІ	2021 Reporting Record & Performance	2022 Reporting Record & Performance	Methodology	Target (Optional)
Palm Oil				
4.1 Priority production landscapes identified	Yes	<u>Yes</u>	Click here	
4.2 Methodology used to identify priority production landscapes	N/A	Yes		
4.3 Number of landscape initiatives currently involved in	N/A	Yes 7, including four that are part of the CGF Forest Positive Coalition's Learning Portfolio of Landscape Initiatives	Methodology not available	
 4.4 For each landscape initiative your company is currently engaged in, information on: Name, location, timeline and other partners involved Report on type of engagement (e.g. disbursed financial support, in-kind support, capacity, preferential sourcing) Specific actions or projects that are supported How the actions intend to address 	N/A	Yes		



[Τ	Γ	
systemic issues and				
contribute to				
delivering forest				
positive goals (at				
least one of				
conservation,				
restoration, positive				
inclusion of farmers				
and communities,				
landscape level				
multi-stakeholder				
platforms or				
partnerships)				
 Linkages to shared 				
landscape-level goals				
developed through				
multistakeholder				
processes				
Soy				
4.1 Priority production	Yes	Vec	<u>Click here</u>	
landscapes identified	fes	<u>Yes</u>	Click Here	
4.2 Methodology used to				
identify priority production	N/A	Yes		
landscapes				
4.3 Number of landscape		Yes		
initiatives currently involved		2 which are both part of the		
in	N/A	CGF Forest Positive Coalition's	Methodology not available	
		Learning Portfolio of		
		Landscape Initiatives		
4.4 For each landscape				
initiative your company is				
currently engaged in,				
information on:	N/A	Yes		
• Name, location,				
	1			
timeline and other				



 Report on type of engagement (e.g. disbursed financial support, in-kind support, capacity, preferential sourcing) Specific actions or projects that are supported How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers and communities, 	
disbursed financial support, in-kind support, capacity, preferential sourcing) • Specific actions or projects that are supported • How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
support, in-kind support, capacity, preferential sourcing)• Specific actions or projects that are supported• How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
support, capacity, preferential sourcing) Specific actions or projects that are supported How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
preferential sourcing) • Specific actions or projects that are supported • How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
 Specific actions or projects that are supported How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers 	
 projects that are supported How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers 	
supported How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers least	
 How the actions intend to address systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers 	
intend to addresssystemic issues andcontribute todelivering forestpositive goals (atleast one ofconservation,restoration, positiveinclusion of farmers	
systemic issues and contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
contribute to delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
delivering forest positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
positive goals (at least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
least one of conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
conservation, restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
restoration, positive inclusion of farmers	
inclusion of farmers	
and communities.	
landscape level	
multi-stakeholder	
platforms or	
partnerships)	
Linkages to shared	
landscape-level goals	
developed through	
multistakeholder	
processes	
РРР	
4.1 Priority production Yes Yes Click here	
landscapes identified Yes Yes Click here	
4.2 Methodology used to	
identify priority production	
landscapes N/A <u>Yes</u>	

Version 1.0 | Last updated 22nd September 2022 | 14



4.3 Number of landscape		Yes		
initiatives currently involved		3 which are all part of the CGF		
in	N/A	Forest Positive Coalition's	Methodology not available	
		Learning Portfolio of		
		Landscape Initiatives		
4.4 For each landscape				
initiative your company is				
currently engaged in,				
information on:				
 Name, location, 				
timeline and other				
partners involved				
 Report on type of 				
engagement (e.g.				
disbursed financial				
support, in-kind				
support, capacity,				
preferential sourcing)				
 Specific actions or 				
projects that are				
supported	N/A	Yes		
 How the actions 				
intend to address				
systemic issues and				
contribute to				
delivering forest				
positive goals (at				
least one of				
conservation,				
restoration, positive				
inclusion of farmers				
and communities,				
landscape level				
multi-stakeholder				
platforms or				
partnerships)				



Linkages to shared landscape-		
level goals developed through		
multistakeholder processes		