C.H. Robinson

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP

.

04/08/2025, 06:57 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

C.H. Robinson Worldwide, Inc. is one of the largest global logistics companies in the world, with consolidated total revenues of 17.6 billion in 2023. We bring together customers, carriers, and suppliers to connect and grow supply chains. We are grounded in our customer promise to use our technology, which is built by and for supply chain experts and powered by our information advantage, to deliver smarter solutions and help navigate increasingly complex global supply chains. These global solutions, combined with the expertise of our people, deliver value–from improved cost reductions and reliability to sustainability and visibility–that our customers and carriers can rely on. Operating throughout North America, Europe, Asia, Oceania, South America, and the Middle East, we offer a global suite of multi-modal services that brings together the value of our expertise and account management services with custom technology differentiated by our unmatched data and scale. As one of the world's largest global logistics platforms, we solve logistics problems for companies across the globe and across industries, from simple to the most complex. We work closely with a wide variety of transportation companies and utilize those relationships to efficiently and cost-effectively arrange the transport of our customers' freight. Our employees, technology, and product portfolio enable us to provide a differentiated experience, remain flexible, and provide solutions that optimize service for our customers. As an integral part of our transportation services, we also provide a wide range of value-added logistics services, such as freight consolidation, customs brokerage, supply chain consulting and analysis, emission analytics, optimization, and reporting. With the combination of our multimodal transportation management system and expertise, we use our information advantage to deliver smarter solutions for more than 90,000 customers and the more than 450,000 contract carriers on our platform.

[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2023	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

17596443000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use this unique identifier?	Provide your unique identifier
CUSIP number	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*12541W209*
Ticker symbol	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*CHRW*
D-U-N-S number	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*02-293-894*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Peru
☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Uruguay
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Thailand
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Singapore

☑ Viet Nam
☑ New Zealand
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ Netherlands
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

	Value chain mapped	Value chain stages covered in mapping	Highest supplier tier mapped
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Upstream value chain ☑ Downstream value chain	*Select from:* ☑ Tier 2 suppliers

[Fixed row]

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

	Plastics mapping	Value chain stages covered in mapping
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Upstream value chain

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

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

These time horizons reflect our likelihood scale or chance of occurrence in a given year versus classification of the risk.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

These time horizons reflect our likelihood scale or chance of occurrence in a given year versus classification of the risk.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

These time horizons reflect our likelihood scale or chance of occurrence in a given year versus classification of the risk.
[Fixed row]

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

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

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

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain
☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:
☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers
☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:
☑ Every three years or more

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term
☑ Medium-term
☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Risk models

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

☑ Other databases, please specify

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

☑ Desk-based research

☑ External consultants

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Chronic physical

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Sea level rise

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Changes to national legislation

☑ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Our internal audit team drives the continuous enterprise risk management program. The impact assessment includes a 1-5 impact scale that describes the extent and period to which a risk event might affect the enterprise from a 1) financial, 2) operational, and 3) strategic perspective. A substantive or "critical" financial impact is considered to be a potential loss of 30 million or more. A substantive or "critical" strategic impact is considered to have significant impact on reputation, loss of market share or market capitalization or requires major corrective action, for example. C.H. Robinson recognizes the importance of identifying and assessing the impacts of climate-related risks and opportunities over the short, medium, and long term. We evaluate both transitional and physical climate-related risks to determine the relative importance of each climate-related risk in alignment with our ERM framework. Transition risks are associated with the transition to a low-carbon global economy and include the assessment of current and emerging regulatory, technology, legal, market, and reputational risks. Physical risks stem from the impacts of climate change. They can be short-term events such as extreme weather events and more long-term changes in weather patterns. We consider climate-related and ESG risks and opportunities over the short-term (0–1 year), medium-term (1–5 years), and long-term (5 years) time horizons. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2–4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050, across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model the company's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. The transition risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three scenarios generated by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS): Net Zero 2050, Delayed Transition, and Current Policies. The degree of impact and likelihood of occurrence was evaluated for each scenario and across the short- (2020–2030), medium- (2030–2040), and long-term (2040–2050). Below is a summary of each scenario and the possible implications to C.H. Robinson.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

We evaluate both transitional and physical climate-related risks to determine the relative importance of each climate-related risk in alignment with our ERM framework. Transition risks are associated with the transition to a low-carbon global economy and include the assessment of current and emerging regulatory, technology, legal, market, and reputational risks. Physical risks stem from the impacts of climate change. They can be short-term events such as extreme weather events and more long-term changes in weather patterns. We consider climate-related and ESG risks and opportunities over the short-term (0–1 year), medium-term (1–5 years), and long-term (5 years) time horizons. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2–4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050, across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model the company's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. The transition risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three scenarios generated by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS): Net Zero 2050, Delayed Transition, and Current Policies. The degree of impact and likelihood of occurrence was evaluated for each scenario and across the short- (2020–2030), medium- (2030–2040), and long-term (2040–2050). Below is a summary of each scenario and the possible implications to C.H. Robinson. Net Zero 2050: An ambitious scenario that limits global warming to 1.5 C through stringent climate policies and innovation, reaching net zero CO2 emissions around 2050. Delayed Transition: This scenario assumes global annual emissions do not decrease until 2030. Strong policies are then needed to limit warming to below 2 C. Emissions may exceed the carbon budget temporarily in the 2020's and decline rapidly after 2030. In a Delayed Transition, the medium-term is more disruptive than in the other scenarios. This is due to significant shifts required to move to a low-carbon trajectory, compensating for previous inaction. Current Policies: This scenario assumes only currently implemented policies are preserved, leading to higher physical risks and lower transition risks than in either the Net Zero 2050 or Delayed Transition scenarios.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas of rapid decline in ecosystem integrity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

C.H. Robinson identified 100 global locations with critical to customers' supply chains across all divisions, modes, and sectors. These locations were reviewed for exposure to risk, potential impacts, and mitigation tactics. The analysis found that none of the locations are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2–4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050, across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model the company's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. This physical risk assessment will be leveraged by internal teams, such as Risk SMEs and Operational Risk Owners to determine how the business can increase resilience to extreme storm events at locations with higher levels of risk.

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

Select from:

☑ No, we have a list/geospatial map of priority locations, but we will not be disclosing it

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Indirect operating costs

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

☑ Other, please specify **:**impact type, including financial, operational and strategic

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Our internal audit team drives the continuous enterprise risk management program. The impact assessment includes a 1-5 impact scale that describes the extent and period to which a risk event might affect the enterprise from a 1) financial, 2) operational, and 3) strategic perspective. A substantive or "critical" financial impact is considered to be a potential loss of 30 million or more. A substantive or "critical" strategic impact is considered to have significant impact on reputation, loss of market share or market capitalization or requires major corrective action, for example. C.H. Robinson recognizes the importance of identifying and assessing the impacts of climate-related risks and opportunities over the short, medium, and long term. We evaluate both transitional and physical climate-related risks to determine the relative importance of each climate-related risk in alignment with our ERM framework. Transition risks are associated with the transition to a low-carbon global economy and include the assessment of current and emerging regulatory, technology, legal, market, and reputational risks. Physical risks stem from the impacts of climate change. They can be short-term events such as extreme weather events and more long-term changes in weather patterns. We consider climate-related and ESG risks and opportunities over the short-term (0–1 year), medium-term (1–5 years), and long-term (5 years) time horizons.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Strategic customers

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

☑ Other, please specify **:**impact type, including financial, operational and strategic.

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Our internal audit team drives the continuous enterprise risk management program. The impact assessment includes a 1-5 impact scale that describes the extent and period to which a risk event might affect the enterprise from a 1) financial, 2) operational, and 3) strategic perspective. A substantive or "critical" financial impact is considered to be a potential loss of 30 million or more. A substantive or "critical" strategic impact is considered to have significant impact on reputation, loss of market share or market capitalization or requires major corrective action, for example. C.H. Robinson recognizes the importance of identifying and assessing the impacts of climate-related risks and opportunities over the short, medium, and long term. We evaluate both transitional and physical climate-related risks to determine the relative importance of each climate-related risk in alignment with our ERM framework. Transition risks are associated with the transition to a low-carbon global economy and include the assessment of current and emerging regulatory, technology, legal, market, and reputational risks. Physical risks stem from the impacts of climate change. They can be short-term events such as extreme weather events and more long-term changes in weather patterns. We consider climate-related and ESG risks and opportunities over the short-term (0–1 year), medium-term (1–5 years), and long-term (5 years) time horizons.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Please note that C.H. Robinson is a third party logistics provider that connects customers to contract carrier options through our tech platform, Navisphere. We do not produce or manufacture anything. This is not a material topic for Robinson.

(3.1.3) Please explain

Please note that C.H. Robinson is a third party logistics provider that connects customers to contract carrier options through our tech platform, Navisphere. We do not produce or manufacture anything. We do not own any vessels, aircraft, trucks, etc. We do lease office locations and provide flexible working for our employees. This is not a material topic for C.H. Robinson through many lenses of materiality, including longstanding guidelines provided by GRI and SASB or critical forest- or water-restrained regions/sources. Please consider this, and review our TCFD report, as you determine applicability.
[Fixed row]

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify **:**All of the above increased severity and frequency

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In addition to transportation and logistics services, we also provide sourcing services under the trade name Robinson Fresh ("Robinson Fresh"). Our sourcing services consist primarily of the buying, selling, and/or marketing of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other value-added perishable items. We supply fresh produce through a network of independent produce growers and suppliers. Our customers include grocery retailers, restaurants, foodservice distributors, and produce wholesalers. We have developed proprietary brands of produce and have exclusive licensing agreements to distribute fresh and value-added produce under recognized consumer brand names. Our sourcing business is dependent upon the supply and price of fresh produce. The supply and price of fresh produce is

affected by weather and growing conditions, including but not limited to, flood, drought, freeze, insects, disease, and other conditions over which we have no control. Commodity prices can be affected by shortages or overproduction and are often highly volatile. If we are unable to secure fresh produce to meet our commitments to our customers, our operating results could be materially and adversely affected, and our customers could switch to our competitors temporarily or permanently. To assure access to certain commodities, we occasionally make monetary advances to growers to finance their operations. Repayment of these advances is dependent upon the growers' ability to grow and harvest marketable crops.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

If we are unable to secure fresh produce to meet our commitments to our customers, our operating results could be materially and adversely affected, and our customers could switch to our competitors temporarily or permanently. To assure access to certain commodities, we occasionally make monetary advances to growers to finance their operations. Repayment of these advances is dependent upon the growers' ability to grow and harvest marketable crops.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Commodity prices can be affected by shortages or overproduction and are often highly volatile. If we are unable to secure fresh produce to meet our commitments to our customers, our operating results could be materially and adversely affected, and our customers could switch to our competitors temporarily or permanently. To assure access to certain commodities, we occasionally make monetary advances to growers to finance their operations. Repayment of these advances is dependent upon the growers' ability to grow and harvest marketable crops.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Robinson Fresh provides sourcing services that primarily include the buying, selling, and/or marketing of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other value-added perishable items. Robinson Fresh sources products from around the world. Commodity prices can be affected by shortages or overproduction and are often highly volatile. If we are unable to secure fresh produce to meet our commitments to our customers, our operating results could be materially and adversely affected, and our customers could switch to our competitors temporarily or permanently. To assure access to certain commodities, we occasionally make monetary advances to growers to finance their operations. Repayment of these advances is dependent upon the growers' ability to grow and harvest marketable crops.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Please see our Form 10-K for more details. Robinson Fresh provides sourcing services that primarily include the buying, selling, and/or marketing of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other value-added perishable items. Robinson Fresh sources products from around the world.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our contracted transportation providers are subject to increasingly stringent laws protecting the environment, including transitional risks relating to climate change, which could directly or indirectly have a material adverse effect on our business. Future and existing environmental regulatory requirements, including evolving transportation technology, in the U.S. and abroad could adversely affect operations and increase operating expenses, which in turn could increase our purchased transportation costs. We may also incur expenses as a result of regulators requiring additional climate-related disclosures regarding our contracted transportation providers that may be labor intensive to report on. Until the timing, scope, and extent of such possible regulation becomes known, we cannot predict its effect on our company, but if we are unable to pass such costs along to our customers, our business could be materially and adversely affected. Even without any new legislation or regulation, increased public concern regarding greenhouse gas emissions by transportation carriers could harm the reputations of companies operating in the transportation logistics industries and shift consumer demand toward more locally sourced products and away from our services.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Selected United States but response is inclusive of anywhere we operate, or where supply chains function. Future and existing environmental regulatory requirements in the U.S. and abroad could adversely affect operations and increase operating expenses, which in turn could increase our purchased transportation costs. If we are unable to pass such costs along to our customers, our business could be materially and adversely affected.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Future and existing environmental regulatory requirements in the U.S. and abroad could adversely affect operations and increase operating expenses, which in turn could increase our purchased transportation costs. If we are unable to pass such costs along to our customers, our business could be materially and adversely affected.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Improve monitoring of upstream and downstream activities

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Please see our Form 10K or TCFD Report for more information. In the Delayed Transition scenario, the inherent risk (impact x likelihood) is greater in the medium-term (2030-2040).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We monitor the regulatory landscape for any requirements that could potentially impact our operations, directly or indirectly. C.H. Robinson may incur higher compliance costs with greater policy stringency in more aggressive climate scenarios. Complying with increased regulations may require C.H. Robinson to invest in additional human and/or technological resources to meet new reporting needs. If C.H. Robinson or its carriers are unable to meet increasing regulatory requirements such as emissions reporting requirements, fuel efficiency requirements, increased climate disclosure mandates or other related regulations, the organization may face noncompliance costs. Carriers may be subject to increased compliance related costs which they may pass on to C.H. Robinson.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify **:**All of the above extreme weather events with increased severity

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increasing extreme weather events such as hurricanes and extreme precipitation can impact transportation infrastructure, ocean freight shipping, cause damage to port locations and damage inventory. We evaluated the impact using climate scenario analysis and climate modeling. The following is also from our Form 10-K: our earnings may be affected by seasonal changes or significant disruptions in the transportation industry. Results of operations for our industry generally show a seasonal pattern as customers reduce shipments during and after the winter holiday season. We believe this historical pattern has been the result of, or influenced by, numerous factors, including national holidays, weather patterns, consumer demand, economic conditions, and other similar and subtle forces.[...] These disruptions may impact the growth rates within the global logistics industry and our ability to provide transportation services for our customers, each of which may adversely impact our results of operations and operating cash flows.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

The following is also from our Form 10-K: These disruptions may impact the growth rates within the global logistics industry and our ability to provide transportation services for our customers, each of which may adversely impact our results of operations and operating cash flows.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Transportation routes may be impacted by severe weather, causing increased customer need for alternative transportation solutions and delays in shipping. Increasing extreme weather events such as hurricanes and extreme precipitation can impact transportation infrastructure, ocean freight shipping, cause damage to port locations and damage inventory. If these extreme events become more frequent and intense, C.H. Robinson may need to provide additional support to customers through rerouting, intermodal solutions or other tactics to continue to support shippers through extreme storms. However, C.H. Robinson offices and facilities may be damaged by extreme weather, inhibiting employees' ability to get to work and carry out their responsibilities.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Improve monitoring of direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Extreme weather events (i.e., hurricanes, flooding) can be the main cause of storm damage to facilities, infrastructure, or other assets. Comprehensive risk rating via climate modeling and scenario analysis provided a proxy of where damage is likely to occur due to the frequency and magnitude of extreme weather events. Additional work would need to be done to evaluate specific site infrastructure.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

C.H. Robinson hired Anthesis to model extreme precipitation, flooding and sea level rise with storm surge climate metrics under three different scenarios to demonstrate the range of potential future worlds C.H. Robinson's operations could be subject to and to better understand exposure to extreme storm events. Multiple scenarios allowed a company to explore how different assumptions about critical driving forces can yield very different outcomes. By considering these different outcomes, we can better assess the range of its potential risks, opportunities, and uncertainties.
[Add row]

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

1
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

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

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Expansion into new markets

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Corporations are rapidly adopting ambitious climate goals including emissions reduction goals across their supply chains and actively identifying strategies to track, manage and achieve these targets. C.H. Robinson's business model optimizes transportation networks and reduces empty miles, leading to an overall reduction in carbon emissions. C.H. Robinson offers supply chain consulting to help customers to identify carbon reduction opportunities through utilizing some or all of the following services and opportunities: mode shifting, consolidation, reverse logistics and network analysis/optimization. For example, we have helped customers identify better location(s) for warehouses to improve efficiency and reduce emissions associated with their supply chain.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

As part of C.H. Robinson's climate scenario analysis and risk assessment, the company identified multiple opportunities within technology and market. C.H. Robinson can continue to expand our customer reach if we can develop digital solutions that provide low carbon options for customers with emissions reduction goals and ambitions to move towards low carbon operations. One example is our Emissions IQ tool.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

As part of C.H. Robinson's climate scenario analysis and risk assessment, the company identified multiple opportunities within technology and market. C.H. Robinson can continue to expand our customer reach if we can develop digital solutions that provide low carbon options for customers with emissions reduction goals and ambitions to move towards low carbon operations. One example is our Emissions IQ tool.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Compliance standards, shipper demand and market availability influence the cost to realize the opportunity.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

New products and services are being improved and launched as a part of our suite of services to customers. We will integrate this into the way our sales and account management teams sell to existing and new customers. We received Smart Freight Centre accreditation for our in-house consulting services' insight into transportation emissions in conformance with the Global Logistics Emissions Council (GLEC) Framework for Logistics Emissions Methodologies in 2023. https://www.smartfreightcentre.org/en/working-with-sfc-accredited-partners-1/

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Move to more energy/resource efficient buildings

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

C.H. Robinson has a large global presence with over 200 locations around the world. The associated energy use and costs tied to these buildings is high. By finding energy efficiencies with current locations and ensuring new buildings are as energy efficient as possible, we are not only able to reduce our own carbon footprint, but also hope to save money through lower energy use.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

We are exploring a number of opportunities with various payback periods. Some of these mechanisms are location specific. For example, we identified a technology that helped to reduce energy use by 4% since installation at our headquarters building.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

We are exploring a number of opportunities with various payback periods. Some of these mechanisms are location specific. For example, we identified a technology that helped to reduce energy use by 4% since installation at our headquarters building.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

We are reviewing the company's greenhouse gas inventory alongside enterprise strategy to evaluate best next steps. Examples from our ESG report are as follows Improvement: Employees in one of our Illinois warehouses implemented a project to reduce energy consumption, while also leveraging a local utility's incentivized efficiency program. The Sustainable Lighting Solutions were installed by an ICC Certified Energy Efficiency Service Provider for new LED fixtures and retrofits. Outcome: In the coming year, the project is estimated to save nearly 75% in energy annually, with a payback period of less than one year. Case Study: Harmonic Energy Filter Improvement: The facilities team at C.H. Robinson headquarters installed new energy filter devices that capture harmonic frequencies from a site's electrical system, removing unnecessary heat and fluctuations to save energy. Outcome: In a proof-of-concept test, the devices saved 5.6% on total kWh used, and proved an ROI of less than 3 years.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We will continue to identify opportunities for energy efficiency at our largest owned and operated facilities, assess the feasibility of energy projects and continue to responsibly leverage RECs. For example, we identified a technology that helped to reduce energy use by 4% since installation at our headquarters building.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

C.H. Robinson has the infrastructure and resources to continue to innovate and invest in R&D to develop solutions that meet emerging market demand for sustainable transport and logistics. C.H. Robinson can invest in the development of other products and services that support customers' sustainability goals, as many have made these targets enterprise priorities.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

There are numerous aspects of assessing financial impact. As a case study, C.H. Robinson has launched a pilot program to deliver emissions reductions through the use of alternative fuels to customers. The program's basis is the Smart Freight Centre/World Economic Forum "book and claim" accounting methodology. C.H. Robinson participated in the working group to develop this framework and invested in the concept. Such a system requires investment in transparency and auditability to ensure credibility and usefulness to customers. This program could then be scaled to other modes and regions, following the conclusion of the pilot.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

There are numerous aspects of assessing financial impact. As a case study, C.H. Robinson has launched a program to deliver emissions reductions through the use of alternative fuels to customers. The program's basis is the Smart Freight Centre/World Economic Forum "book and claim" accounting methodology. C.H. Robinson participated in the working group to develop this framework and invested in the concept. Such a system requires investment in transparency and auditability to ensure credibility and usefulness to customers. This program could then be scaled to other modes and regions, following the conclusion of the pilot.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Shipper demand and market availability will influence the cost to realize the opportunity.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

By driving more technology, products and services infrastructure to market, C.H. Robinson could offer solutions to help customers advance and meet their sustainability targets. In the beginning of 2023, C.H. Robinson conducted climate scenario analysis and risk assessment to identify both risks and opportunities. The effort incorporated cross-functional leaders representing various modes and divisions.
[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

	Financial metric	Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)	Explanation of financial figures
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Revenue	*1*	*Figures are integrated into company strategy. Please see our annual reporting and SEC filings for more information.*

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

Qualifications and criteria are included in the company's Corporate Governance Guidelines as follows: Directors should possess the highest personal and professional ethics, integrity and values, and be committed to representing the long-term interests of Robinson's stockholders. The selection and nomination process shall be conducted by the Governance Committee, with input and recommendations from any director. The Governance Committee will consider appropriate criteria including: current or recent experience as a board member or as a chief executive officer or other executive position, expertise in a particular business discipline, and diversity of talent, experience, accomplishments and perspective. Nominees recommended by stockholders will be brought to the attention of the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee shall recommend nominees to the Board.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

C.H. Robinson WorldwideInc_Governance_BoardGovernance.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**C.H. Robinson not produce or manufacture anything, nor do we own any vessels, aircraft, trucks, etc. We do lease office locations and provide flexible working for our employees.

(4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

C.H. Robinson is a third-party logistics provider connecting customers to contract carrier options through our tech platform, Navisphere. We do not produce or manufacture anything, nor do we own any vessels, aircraft, trucks, etc. We do lease office locations and provide flexible working for our employees. This is not a material topic through many lenses of materiality, including longstanding guidelines provided by GRI and SASB or critical forest- or water-restrained regions/sources.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Corporate Governance Guidelines; TCFD Report

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

C.H. Robinson is committed to being a strong corporate citizen and integrity is core to our success. We believe identifying and managing critical ESG topics helps ensure the sustainability of our company, drives long-term value for our stakeholders, and is a competitive advantage in today's rapidly evolving marketplace. We are committed to integrating climate-related issues throughout our governance and management processes. The Board has oversight of ESG strategy and performance, and Board committees also engage on ESG topics on the scope of their charters regularly. The Board generally meets at least four times a year to oversee; review; and, where appropriate, approve fundamental operating, financial, risk management, and other corporate strategies, as well as major plans and objectives. The full Board receives regular updates at least bi-annually from management, including our Vice President of ESG, on ESG strategy and risk management. In addition to regularly scheduled updates to the C.H. Robinson Board, we add time to review climate-related topics if they arise outside of the scheduled time. Committees oversee specific areas of our ESG efforts. The Audit Committee has oversight of ethics and compliance, risk management, cybersecurity, data privacy, and reporting on ESG-related metrics. The Talent and Compensation Committee has oversight of talent strategies; diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI); company culture; and other talent-related topics. The Governance Committee receives regular updates on ESG strategy and risks, and environmental sustainability.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Our Chief Sustainability Officer has the title of Chief ESG Officer. The Chief ESG Officer oversees the enterprise ESG team, which includes sustainability and environmental issues. The Chief ESG Officer reports directly to the President and Chief Executive Officer, who is a member of the Board of Directors of C.H. Robinson. The Chief ESG Officer also reports to the Governance Committee at least annually according to the Committee's charter, and typically provides updates on a quarterly basis or as frequently as matters arise.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Please note that C.H. Robinson is a third party logistics provider that connects customers to contract carrier options through our tech platform, Navisphere. We also do not produce or manufacture anything. We do not own any vessels, aircraft, trucks, etc. We do lease office locations and provide flexible working for our employees. This is not a material topic for C.H. Robinson through many lenses of materiality, including longstanding guidelines provided by GRI and SASB or critical forest- or water-restrained regions/sources. Please consider this as you determine applicability.
[Add row]

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

	Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue	% of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue	Please explain
Climate change	*Select from:*	*0*	*Incentive is non-monetary.*

	Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue	% of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue	Please explain
	☑ Yes		

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Environment/Sustainability manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Non-monetary award

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Engagement

☑ Other engagement-related metrics, please specify **:**Materiality assessment, climate scenario analysis implementation

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ The incentives are not linked to an incentive plan, or equivalent (e.g. discretionary bonus in the reporting year)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The Sustainability Director is responsible for managing reduction initiatives and advancing target-setting. Success is tied to non-monetary recognition during the review period.

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

Success in managing reduction initiatives and advancing target-setting are part of the role's annual performance goals within the company's formalized review process. The role also leverages these opportunities for development.
[Add row]

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

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

We have a global commitment to continuous improvement as well as to climate mitigation work. The coverage of this commitment is inclusive of all entities, all divisions, all subsidiaries, globally.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

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

Select all that apply

☑ No, but we plan to align in the next two years

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

CHR environmental policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**EPA SmartWay and Smart Freight Centre

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

Since 2005, C.H. Robinson has been a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) SmartWay program, which helps companies advance supply chain sustainability by measuring, benchmarking, and improving freight transportation efficiency. The program is a voluntary partnership between various freight industry sectors and the EPA. It establishes incentives for fuel efficiency improvements and greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emission reductions. C.H. Robinson is also a premium member of the Smart Freight Centre, a leading nonprofit organization focused on sustainability in transportation. The group is focused on decarbonization within the industry, and is the lead author of the Global Logistics Emissions Council (GLEC) methodology V3 and the Voluntary Market-based Measures Framework for book-and-claim emissions accounting in logistics. C.H. Robinson is hosting the Smart Freight Centre fall meeting at the Chicago Central office in October 2024. Sustainable aviation fuel (SAF), procurement and fleet electrification will be primary topics on the agenda.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to have one in the next two years

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

C.H. Robinson conducts a new materiality assessment every three years, and refreshes the results on an annual basis. As part of this work, the ESG team evaluates the positions of relevant memberships and incorporates those into the analysis. Additionally, engagement with industry groups often provides insight into industry trends and issues. Therefore, it's important that we regularly engage with our stakeholders to identify priorities, gauge risks and opportunities, and help ensure responsible business practices. In 2023, we engaged with key stakeholder groups in various ways. Please see our ESG report or annual report for more information on engagement topics and stakeholders.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) or charitable organization

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

Smart Freight Centre, Smart Freight Buyers Alliance

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Smart Freight Centre's mission is to accelerate the reduction of logistics emissions by fostering collaboration within the global logistics ecosystem. The Smart Freight Buyers Alliance aims to accomplish this by uniting corporate freight buyers to shift towards zero-emissions freight across all modes of transport in collaboration with their supply chains and partners. As one of the world’s most-connected logistics providers, C.H. Robinson has long been recognized as an innovative thought leader that is uniquely positioned to solve some of the most complex issues facing our industry today. It is our mission to improve the world’s supply chains, which is critical to creating a more sustainable future. We put our customers at the center of everything we do, and for decades we’ve helped companies improve how they transport their goods—constantly looking to reduce waste, consolidate freight, and eliminate empty miles.

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

10000

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

This figure is the annual membership fee required of all premium members of the Smart Freight Centre to participate. We believe support for this organization will allow us to engage with like-minded organizations to solve for decarbonization issues in the transportation industry.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply
☑ GRI
☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Public policy engagement
☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

pages 5-15; 24-28; 34-44

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

CHR-ESG-Report-english (1).pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

C.H. Robinson ESG Report (2023)

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In other regulatory filings

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

☑ Value chain engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

pages 18-31

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

chrw-2023-annual-report-10-k.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

C.H. Robinson 2023 Annual Report

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Please see all

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

TCFD REPORT_6.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

C.H. Robinson TCFD Report 2023 (FY2023 data)
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Every three years or less frequently

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA 2DS

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Given the nuanced structure of our business, we understand that climate change will impact stakeholder groups, operations and services at different to high-level, North America operations and a time cap through the year 2030. We conducted our discussion in-house with representatives from North America to bring perspective for market, government affairs, carriers, reputation, etc. Using data from the IEA's 2DS scenario, the discussion.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Given the nuanced structure of our business, we understand that climate change will impact stakeholder groups, operations and services at different to high-level, North America operations and a time cap through the year 2030. We conducted our discussion in-house with representatives from North America to bring perspective for market, government affairs, carriers, reputation, etc. Using data from the IEA's 2DS scenario, the discussion.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify **:**The transition risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three scenarios generated by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS): Net Zero 2050, Delayed Transition, and Current Policies.

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The transition risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three scenarios generated by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS): Net Zero 2050, Delayed Transition and Current Policies. The degree of impact and likelihood of occurrence was evaluated for each scenario and across the short- (2020-2030), medium- (2030-2040), and long-term (2040-2050). Below is a summary of each scenario and the possible implications to C.H. Robinson. Net Zero 2050: In this scenario, strong policy action and technology innovation support the transition of transportation towards lower emissions. Moreover, customers will become increasingly interested in low emissions services to help them keep up with regulatory demands to reduce their own emissions. Delayed Transition: This scenario assumes global annual emissions do not decrease until 2030. In the medium-term is more disruptive than in the other scenarios. This is due to significant shifts required to move to a low-carbon trajectory, compensating for previous inaction. Post-2030, C.H. Robinson could face intense competition from other logistics providers in sourcing carriers that use alternative fuels and advanced technologies. Current Policies: This scenario assumes that only currently implemented policies

are preserved, leading to higher physical risks and lower transition risks than the scenarios. In the Current Policies scenario, C.H. Robinson may struggle to compete with other providers who are able to capture a niche, high margin market for customers looking for sustainable transportation options. Costs directly attributable to policy, like compliance costs and carbon taxes, are expected to be low based on continuing public sector inaction.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

NGFS scenarios were selected as each of their scenarios provides a common and up-to-date reference point for understanding how climate change, climate policy and technology trends could evolve in different futures. The NGFS scenarios provide granular data on transition pathways and climate impacts. The scenarios highlight some key themes that can be used to help guide decision-making and set more granular targets; thereby making them a good fit to meet C.H. Robinson's needs. Drivers were chosen in line with the TCFD guidance and from input received from C.H. Robinson's stakeholders. As part of this analysis Policy and Legal, Market and Technology transition drivers were assessed against each scenario at short (2020 to 2030), medium (2030 to 2040) and long-term (2040 to 2050) time horizons.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Please note that we selected RCP because no other selection option was available to coincide with the SSPs. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2–4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050, across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model the company's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. This physical risk assessment will be leveraged by internal teams, such as Risk SMEs and Operational Risk Owners to determine how the business can increase resilience to extreme storm events at locations with higher levels of risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

In 2023, C.H. Robinson conducted scenario analysis for physical and transition risks to evaluate the business' resilience to various possible warming scenarios. Some findings that came out from this scenario analysis include: 1. Extreme storm events causing damage to transportation infrastructure and warehouses pose both physical impacts as well as require C.H. Robinson to provide additional support to customers through re-routing, intermodal solutions or other tactics 2. Favorable policy and market conditions are needed to support carriers in adopting technology to meet shifting customer preferences for sustainable logistics solutions 3. Growing interest and scrutiny over greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions may drive customer demand for digital solutions to track and monitor supply chain emissions. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways ("SSP"), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-

2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2C-4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050 across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model C.H. Robinson's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. This physical risk assessment will be leveraged by internal teams, such as Risk SMEs and Operational Risk Owners to determine how the business can increase resilience to extreme storm events at locations with higher levels of risk.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Number of ecosystems impacted

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Please note that we selected RCP because no other selection option was available to coincide with the SSPs. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2–4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050, across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model the company's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. This physical risk assessment will be leveraged by internal teams, such as Risk SMEs and Operational Risk Owners to determine how the business can increase resilience to extreme storm events at locations with higher levels of risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

See our TCFD Report for full information. In a Net Zero 2050 scenario, strong policy action and technology innovation support the transition of transportation towards lower emissions. Moreover, customers are becoming increasingly interested in low emissions services to help them keep up with regulatory demands to reduce their own emissions. C.H. Robinson is asset-light and relies on contract carriers. If contracted carriers are unable to keep up with adopting more fuel and cost-effective options, C.H. Robinson risks losing sustainability-motivated customers to providers who are able to offer low emissions services. C.H. Robinson may also need to invest more into digital products as demand for emissions tracking and reduction solutions grows. C.H. Robinson may experience higher costs associated with compliance with carbon regulation. Impacts of climate policy under this scenario, like carbon taxes and compliance costs, can be softened through substitution of lower carbon alternatives for high emitting technologies. In a Delayed Transition, the medium-term is more disruptive than in the other scenarios. This is due to significant shifts required to move to a low-carbon trajectory, compensating for previous inaction. Post-2030, C.H. Robinson could face intense competition from other logistics providers that have already started preparing for and transitioning their fleets to alternative fuels and advanced technologies. Based on the drastic increase in regulatory measures and variation in approach in implementing climate policy, C.H. Robinson may incur significant costs to comply. All this can affect C.H. Robinson's ability to serve customers and meet their shifting demands. In the Current Policies scenario, C.H. Robinson will compete with other providers who are also

capturing a niche, high margin market for customers looking for sustainable transportation options. Costs directly attributable to policy, like compliance costs and carbon taxes, are expected to be low based on continuing public sector inaction. With limited policy support, carriers may incur high costs, or be priced out of, adopting alternative fuels or advanced energy efficient technologies. For those contract carriers who chose to transition to greener fleets, these high upfront capital costs may be passed on to C.H. Robinson or their customers and increase operating costs. However, customers would likely not be willing to pay higher costs for low carbon services, as they aren't mandated to de

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Number of ecosystems impacted

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Granularity of available data (from aggregated to local)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Please note that we selected RCP because no other selection option was available to coincide with the SSPs. The physical risk scenario analysis evaluated the implications to the business across three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP), as defined by the IPCC: SSP1-2.6 (below 2C warming), SSP2-4.5 (2–4C) and SSP5-8.5 (above 4C). The risk of exposure to extreme precipitation, flooding, tropical cyclones, and sea level rise with storm surge was evaluated for each scenario, in time horizons 2030 and 2050, across 100 global locations important to C.H. Robinson shipping and logistics. The modeled risk exposure to each of the above types of physical risks were combined to model the company's overall exposure to extreme storm events for those 100 locations. Risks were evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 very low; 5 very high) based on thresholds set according to underlying data. The analysis found that none of the locations included are at very high total risk of extreme storm events in 2030 across all scenarios. This physical risk assessment will be leveraged by internal teams, such as Risk SMEs and Operational Risk Owners to determine how the business can increase resilience to extreme storm events at locations with higher levels of risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

See our TCFD Report for full information. In a Net Zero 2050 scenario, strong policy action and technology innovation support the transition of transportation towards lower emissions. Moreover, customers are becoming increasingly interested in low emissions services to help them keep up with regulatory demands to reduce their own emissions. C.H. Robinson is asset-light and relies on contract carriers. If contracted carriers are unable to keep up with adopting more fuel and cost-effective options, C.H. Robinson risks losing sustainability-motivated customers to providers who are able to offer low emissions services. C.H. Robinson may also need to invest more into digital products as demand for emissions tracking and reduction solutions grows. C.H. Robinson may experience higher costs associated with compliance with carbon regulation. Impacts of climate policy under this scenario, like carbon taxes and compliance costs, can be softened through substitution of lower carbon alternatives for high emitting technologies. In a Delayed Transition, the medium-term is more disruptive than in the other scenarios. This is due to significant shifts required to move to a low-carbon trajectory, compensating for previous inaction. Post-2030, C.H. Robinson could face intense competition from other logistics providers that have already started preparing for and transitioning their fleets to alternative fuels and advanced technologies. Based on the drastic increase in regulatory measures and variation in approach in implementing climate policy, C.H. Robinson may incur significant costs to comply. All this can affect C.H. Robinson's ability to serve customers and meet their shifting demands. In the Current Policies scenario, C.H. Robinson will compete with other providers who are also capturing a niche, high margin market for customers looking for sustainable transportation options. Costs directly attributable to policy, like compliance costs and carbon taxes, are expected to be low based on continuing public sector inaction. With limited policy support, carriers may incur high costs, or be priced out of,

adopting alternative fuels or advanced energy efficient technologies. For those contract carriers who chose to transition to greener fleets, these high upfront capital costs may be passed on to C.H. Robinson or their customers and increase operating costs. However, customers would likely not be willing to pay higher costs for low carbon services, as they aren't mandated to de
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

See our TCFD Report for full information. In a Net Zero 2050 scenario, strong policy action and technology innovation support the transition of transportation towards lower emissions. Moreover, customers are becoming increasingly interested in low emissions services to help them keep up with regulatory demands to reduce their own emissions. C.H. Robinson is asset-light and relies on contract carriers. If contracted carriers are unable to keep up with adopting more fuel and cost-effective options, C.H. Robinson risks losing sustainability-motivated customers to providers who are able to offer low emissions services. C.H. Robinson may also need to invest more into digital products as demand for emissions tracking and reduction solutions grows. C.H. Robinson may experience higher costs associated with compliance with carbon regulation. Impacts of climate policy under this scenario, like carbon taxes and compliance costs, can be softened through substitution of lower carbon alternatives for high emitting technologies. In a Delayed Transition, the medium-term is more disruptive than in the other scenarios. This is due to significant shifts required to move to a low-carbon trajectory, compensating for previous inaction. Post-2030, C.H. Robinson could face intense competition from other logistics providers that have already started preparing for and transitioning their fleets to alternative fuels and advanced technologies. Based on the drastic increase in regulatory measures and variation in approach in implementing climate policy, C.H. Robinson may incur significant costs to comply. All this can affect C.H. Robinson's ability to serve customers and meet their shifting demands. In the Current Policies scenario, C.H. Robinson will compete with other providers who are also

capturing a niche, high margin market for customers looking for sustainable transportation options. Costs directly attributable to policy, like compliance costs and carbon taxes, are expected to be low based on continuing public sector inaction. With limited policy support, carriers may incur high costs, or be priced out of, adopting alternative fuels or advanced energy efficient technologies. For those contract carriers who chose to transition to greener fleets, these high upfront capital costs may be passed on to C.H. Robinson or their customers and increase operating costs. However, customers would likely not be willing to pay higher costs for low carbon services, as they aren't mandated to decrease their emissions. Therefore, asking higher prices for low carbon services might drive customers to switch to less expensive models such as rail, in which there is limited capacity and route flexibility. Physical impacts in this scenario are higher and could result in severe impacts to critical public transportation infrastructure or contract carrier fleets. This could cause increased supply chain disruptions and strain C.H. Robinson's capacity to serve intermodal needs quickly.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:
☑ No, but we are developing a climate transition plan within the next two years

(5.2.15) Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Development of a climate transition plan is on our roadmap. We have published a climate risk report in line with the TCFD standards. We are also exploring a new climate target that will be presented to our senior leaders.

(5.2.16) Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

C.H. Robinson is strategically planning to develop a comprehensive climate transition plan following the anticipated sale of our EST business in 2025. Prior to this development, we had already modeled targets and drafted strategic documents. Currently, we are navigating the implementation of a new business strategy. We have conducted thorough scenario analyses and a double materiality assessment, and we are actively working on projecting new targets and alongside a detailed roadmap to achieve them.
[Fixed row]

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?

(5.3.1) Environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy and/or financial planning

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

(5.3.2) Business areas where environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

We have seen an increased demand from customers for services related to lowering their carbon emissions in their supply chains, which has led to us creating a cross-functional team to assess feasibility of and develop additional carbon-related products and services. For example, our growing consulting business is now accepting data from new and existing customers for a full analysis on emissions output and reductions strategies. Overall, time horizons for product and services opportunities are typically short-term.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

In 2021, we conducted a first climate scenario analysis to evaluate C.H. Robinson's risks and opportunities through the lens of climate change. This practice is in alignment with the recommendations set by global standard setting bodies, including the TCFD. Note that physical, weather-related risks to operations are currently evaluated through other business continuity processes and were excluded from our analysis. In this iteration, we focused on transition risks by using a widely-used scenario from the International Energy Agency (IEA)'s Energy Technology Perspectives Model. The '2DS' (two degrees scenario) from the IEA depicts an emissions trajectory that limits the average global temperature rise to 2C. This hypothetical trajectory takes into account new legislation, available technology, energy capacity, fuel costs and other economic drivers. Given the nuanced structure of our business, we understand that climate change will impact stakeholder groups, operations and services at different levels. Therefore, for our first climate risk analysis, we limited our discussion to high-level, North America operations and a time cap through the year 2030. Our next climate scenario analysis involved interviewing account teams on their risk management models.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

C.H. Robinson has committed to investing 1 billion in technology innovation over a five-year period to bring the value of technology, data, and analytics to our customers. As it relates to climate, we have engaged our innovation lab – Robinson Labs – as a large component of our approach to our customer facing products. In 2021, we launched Emissions IQ, an emissions reporting tool that is free for our customers and provides them insight into their Scope 3 transportation emissions and efficiency data. Overall, time horizons for product and services opportunities are typically in the short- or medium term.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Yes, opportunities with regard to our operations have influenced our strategy. We assess our locations and determine where we have opportunity to consolidate office locations, which would lead to lower carbon emissions. Additionally, as we assess new locations, green building is a factor in our assessment and considered a preference. We are also building a cross-functional working group to continue identifying opportunities and improvements. Overall, time horizons for operations opportunities are typically in the short- or medium- term.
[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs
☑ Indirect costs
☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

We anticipate additional revenues from sustainability services for customers and carriers. As consumers and customers preferences continue to shift toward supporting a low-carbon economy, the risk of excluding climate-related opportunities has influenced our financial planning. Therefore, we have placed resources behind efforts to expand products, services and intelligence in this space.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	Select from:

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Climate goal development is our current priority.*

[Fixed row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Customers	*Select from:*	*Select all that apply*

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
	☑ Yes	☑ Climate change
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

We are unique from traditional asset-owning companies in that we provide solutions without an owned fleet. As part of our engagement on ESG topics, we prioritize those areas related to this unique business model that offer the greatest potential for impact. Classification, or prioritization, of carriers is determined by the engagement conducted via materiality assessment, scenario analysis, and regulatory monitoring. These methods provide guidance on dependencies and impacts on the environment.

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our business model is fundamental to how we approach environmental, social, and governance (ESG) strategy at C.H. Robinson. As one of the world's largest and most connected logistics providers, we arrange the transport of our customers' freight and support supply chain optimization through data-driven insights and technology. Industry classifications often label us as a transportation company; however, we are unique from traditional asset-owning transportation companies in that we leverage a global network of logistics solutions without an owned fleet. As part of our engagement on ESG topics, we prioritize those areas related to this unique business model that offer the greatest potential for impact. At C.H. Robinson, we regularly engage with our stakeholders to identify priorities, gauge risks and opportunities, and help ensure responsible business practices. In 2023, we engaged with key stakeholder groups in various ways.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

In 2021, C.H. Robinson launched a third-party supplier code of conduct which requires suppliers to meet all environmental regulatory requirements. This code of conduct is part of the master service agreement and applies to suppliers on a global scale. We provide resources for monitoring and maintaining compliance, including a whistleblowing hotline.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify **:**Suppliers are required to comply with applicable environmental regulations where they do business, regardless of whether they are local, regional or a broader scope.

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Evaluate, confirm and engage - exclusion, suspension, retention are variable depending on the nature of the compliance issue.

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ None

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply
☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

No suppliers identified as non-compliant through current evaluation procedures.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

☑ Other capacity building activity, please specify :Support interested suppliers in engaging on environmental topics, informing them about trends or shipper interests

Information collection

☑ Other information collection activity, please specify :Alternative fuel use, advanced technology use

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Engagement methods described here are conducted across all modes. Carriers are identified for proactive engagement based on interest in capacity-building, regulatory compliance needs, etc. Figures here indicate that all carriers are considered as part of this informal process, though not necessarily a part of direct engagement.

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

Select from:

☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

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

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing
☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

A previous C.H. Robinson customer research study revealed that sustainability is shippers' second biggest pain point and the number of companies planning to take action to reduce their carbon footprint doubled between 2020 and 2021. With C.H. Robinson's nearly 200,000 customers and carriers, the projected emission reductions and financial savings will grow on an annual basis. Along with other leading organizations, C.H. Robinson has supported Smart Freight Centre in partnership with World Economic Forum to develop a framework and accounting guidelines for a book and claim chain of custody system for transportation supply chain emission reduction actions. Within these guidelines, we are able to identify opportunities for reduction that also generate demand for alternative fuel as well as advanced equipment, with consideration for additionality, vintage requirements and other notable constraints. Because this framework is a global resource, it is applicable to all customers, with consideration for mode.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Emissions IQ, our proprietary tool, has increased its scope year over year and the number of users has increased again.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:
☑ None

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

Dialogue with investors/shareholders is primarily conducted through engagement conversations, discussions in materiality assessments, or roadmap development. We disclose information publicly through our ESG Report, TCFD Report, CDP, EcoVadis and other disclosures.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Information-sharing is critical to understanding mutual priorities, criticality within the climate risk landscape, and opportunities within the industry.
[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :CDP Supply Chain member engagement is not the driver of environmental initiatives. Shippers and CHR engage directly to identify opportunities.	*We engage directly with shippers on supply chain decarbonization.*

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational control indicates where C.H. Robinson has clear authority to implement changes or institute policies, and where we clearly manage risks and opportunities.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**This was not identified as a material topic for C.H. Robinson.

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

Plastics are not a material topic for C.H. Robinson as we are non-asset owning logistics provider and do not manufacture products or source materials. This was confirmed as part of a 2024 double materiality assessment, and our recent climate scenario analysis engagement.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**This was not identified as a material topic for C.H. Robinson.

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

Biodiversity is not a material topic for C.H. Robinson as we are non-asset owning logistics provider and do not manufacture products or source raw materials. This was confirmed as part of a 2024 double materiality assessment, and our recent climate scenario analysis engagement.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2006

☑ US EPA Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)

☑ Smart Freight Centre: GLEC Framework for Logistics Emissions Methodologies

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

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Indirect Emissions From Purchased Electricity

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion Sources

☑ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

☑ Other, please specify **:**Australia - ADCCEE (2023), Environment Canada (2023), Green-e Residual Mix Emissions Rates for US customers (2023), Government of Brazil-Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (2023), CO2emissiefactoren (2023)

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

Purchased steam, chilled water, and estimated natural gas emissions are reported in Scope 2, while actual natural gas emissions are included in Scope 1. The Greenhouse Gas Protocol was the source of the GHG accounting protocols and equations. C.H. Robinson uses the most current emissions factors available. Scope 2 emissions are calculated following both the location-based and the market-based methodologies. Location-based factors are taken from eGRID (US) and IEA (other countries); market-based factors are taken from Green-e (US), AIB (Europe), and IEA. The latest datasets available at the time of publication are used. Emission factors for specific contracts were used. Where no contract was in place, the residual grid emission factor was used. If a residual grid emissions factor is not available in a region, the average grid emission factor was used as recommended in Table 6.2 of the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

	Base year end	Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Scope 1	*12/31/2018*	*2459.0*
Scope 2 (location-based)	*12/31/2018*	*38389.0*
Scope 2 (market-based)	*12/31/2018*	*39041.0*
Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services	*12/31/2021*	*276805.0*
Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution	*12/31/2021*	*17083845.0*

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Reporting year	*7508*

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)
Reporting year	*24532*	*19260*

[Fixed row]

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

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

293484

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Other, please specify **:**LCA factors from lifecycle analysis

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Data obtained from suppliers is related to specifically what was ordered/received by Robinson Fresh and customers. C.H. Robinson serves as Robinson Fresh's logistics provider. Of the commodities' upstream purchased goods and services emissions, 86% of reported emissions were calculated using life cycle analysis (LCA) factors. Cradle to gate (of the farm) LCA factors were sourced at the commodity level from 4 different LCA databases. About 14% of reported emissions were calculated using spend data combined with US EPA Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for US Industries and Commodities, published in 2020 and modified in v1.1.1, January 2022. The spend based emissions calculations include an upstream transportation component that is embedded in the factor. After further review, all the LCA database factors include a sort of upstream transport mode in the factor as well. Future assessments will aim to understand the "farmer transportation" piece of the datasets and how best to achieve on-the-ground data to replace LCA datasets.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

17703076

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

Downstream transportation is reported for transportation organized by C.H. Robinson on behalf of its customers. (see below for potential additional note on scope categorization) Emissions reported emissions were calculated using actual distance traveled and weight transported data tracked by C.H. Robinson using the Global Logistics Emissions Council (GLEC) Framework for Logistics Emissions Methodology. Default and modelled data are the primary methods for estimation methodology. The GLEC Framework carries the 'built on GHG Protocol' mark, and as such is recognized as being in conformance with GHG Protocol Standards.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.5) Please explain

We used spend-based data to determine the materiality of each Scope 3 category using the Quantis Scope 3 evaluator and review by a third-party consultant. We confirmed that this category is not relevant to our greenhouse gas footprint. Emissions here are for example only and from our initial 2021 analysis.
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway but not complete for current reporting year – first year it has taken place

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Not applicable yet

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway but not complete for current reporting year – first year it has taken place

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

N/A

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway but not complete for current reporting year – first year it has taken place

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

N/A

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Attestation standards established by AICPA (AT105)
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Increased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

611.89

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

9.36

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Renewable electricity / green tariff consumption are purchased to cover Robinson Fresh warehouses, Eden Prairie headquarters, and MN-based data centers. As the electricity of this consumption reduced year-over-year in these locations, the renewable energy consumption reduced accordingly. This resulted in a proportional decrease in emissions reduced compared to 2022. Site-based policies on renewable energy consumption will be considered in the future.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

We maintained emissions reduction activities and began to evaluate certain site-specific projects. However, this was not proportional enough to balance out the increases in other categories, therefore, the overall emissions are higher year-over-year. Please see "change in output" and "change in methodology."

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6572.14

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

17.02

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Increase in propane, jet fuel and electricity consumption year-over-year generated higher emissions. Figures here represent the percent increase of combined fuel consumption between 2022 and 2023.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2780.55

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

26.01

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

A decrease in natural gas use was reported due to a change in methodology. Estimation methods were more conservative for 2023 data but estimated sites changed.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4443

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

6.85

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Total number of sites increased from 292 to 312, 6.85%. Total square footage increased 14% from 2022 to 2023. Total increase in combined Scope 12 (market-based) CO2e is listed here as 4,443 mtCO2e. The 6.85% represents the increase in sites only.

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

5419

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

5

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

21

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

2063

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.93

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

51.38

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

51.38

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

89.61

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

306

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

372.89

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.59

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

19.29

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

30

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

131

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

20.45

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

19

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

254

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

11.99

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

122.7

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

180.24

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

180.24

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.22

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

19.92

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

19.92

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

78.04

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

656.57

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

656.57

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8.27

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8.27

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10.71

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

14.36

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23.79

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

48.09

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

67.91

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

92.38

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

232.93

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

431.64

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.23

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

141.62

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

141.62

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17.04

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

7.58

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

10.95

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

540

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

540

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20.83

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

54.56

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

54.56

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8.27

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

31.38

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

44.82

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23.84

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

61.27

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

96.91

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8.83

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

115.14

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

115.14

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

169.5

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

169.5

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

115.65

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

323.56

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

386.66

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.65

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

21.2

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

126.81

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8.05

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8.39

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8.39

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

275.28

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

289.54

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

403.9

Puerto Rico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.26

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2.17

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

2.17

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

24.12

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

24.12

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

238.85

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0.13

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0.13

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.07

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

31.69

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

31.69

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

53

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

72.23

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

125.93

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.02

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0.1

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0.3

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

88.04

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

88.04

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

55.96

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

55.96

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

40.75

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

40.75

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.43

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

4.11

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4.11

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57.81

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

79.11

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

126.56

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5781.69

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

20772.34

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

14767.24

Uruguay

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.89

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

7.16

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

7.16

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

24.97

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

24.97
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By activity

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Liquid fuel activities*	*1799*
Row 2	*Refrigerant gasses*	*2063*
Row 3	*Gaseous fuel activities*	*1522*
Row 4	*Natural gas*	*2124*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Electricity (purchased)*	*22700*	*17428*
Row 2	*Heat, Steam and Chilled Water*	*1*	*1*
Row 3	*Natural gas (estimated)*	*1831*	*1831*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7508

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24532

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19260

(7.22.4) Please explain

We are reporting for C.H. Robinson Worldwide, Inc. (CHRW), which is inclusive of all divisions and subsidiaries and in line with our financial reporting to the SEC.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

We are reporting for C.H. Robinson Worldwide, Inc. (CHRW), which is inclusive of all divisions and subsidiaries and in line with our financial reporting to the SEC. [Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply
☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

13222

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1306

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

58014

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

16635

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

141852

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2188

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25135

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6854

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

12254

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

304

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1747

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 16

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10056

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 17

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5191

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 18

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4841.67

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 19

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

2624

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 20

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

31629

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 21

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

47914

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 22

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

23392.17

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 23

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 24

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8289

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 25

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify **:**C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

127

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 26

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

256

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 27

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.

Row 28

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :C.H. Robinson's emissions reporting tool, Emissions IQ, is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Emissions stated here are specific to the requesting member and the freight moved with C.H. Robinson.

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5573

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Transportation

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

C.H. Robinson calculates each individual shipper's Scope 3 emissions, specific to their supply chain. We combine these into Scope 3, downstream emissions. C.H. Robinson's Emissions IQ is accredited by the Smart Freight Centre according to the GLEC methodology. Figures are well-to-wheel.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Please see Smart Freight Centre's GLEC methodology, V2 and V3 for reference.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ We face no challenges

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We provide our customers with free emissions reporting associated with their shipments through Emissions IQ, which is accredited to use the GLEC framework.
[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

	Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Secondary data used. No allocation method necessary.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

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

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

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

8103.51

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

8103.51

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

15789

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

42100

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

57889

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

406.98

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

406.98

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

3.29

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

3.29

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

15879

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

50613.78

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

66403.78
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

3762

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No. 2 Oil (Diesel)

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

6923

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Propane and LPG

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

10685

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

15789

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

2023 is the year of repowering.
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

128

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

66

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

194.00

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

433

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

123

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

556.00

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

34

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

69

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

103.00

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

138

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

407

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

545.00

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

65

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

18

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

83.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1107

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

635

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1742.00

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

53

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

53.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1001

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

240

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1241.00

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

50

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

3

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

53.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

26

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

40.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

280

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

175

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

455.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

560

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

253

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

813.00

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

221

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

221.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

22

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

43

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

65.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

713

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

162

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

875.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

69

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

70.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

79

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

38

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

117.00

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

174

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

89

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

263.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

175

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

37

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

212.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

416

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

416.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

595

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

595.00

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

157

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

157.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

27.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

463

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

463.00

Puerto Rico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

12.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

52

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

52.00

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

82

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

82.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

413

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

64

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

477.00

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

7.00

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

154

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

154.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

119

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

119.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

97

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

97.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

9.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

298

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

238

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

536.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33801

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

33801.00

Uruguay

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

19

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

58.00

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

44

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

44.00
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.00152

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

7508

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

17596443

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

47.57

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

(7.45.9) Please explain

Both the number of sites and square footage increased year over year. We also saw a significant increase in use of aviation fuel for jet usage since last year.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Intensity target

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 2°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

01/01/2018

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO2e per square foot

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.000341

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.00541

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0057510000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

01/01/2025

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

40

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0034506000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0000000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

250.00

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

No exclusions; global

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.53.2.89) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Energy efficiencies, including lighting
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ No other climate-related targets

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*1*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*213*
Implementation commenced	*1*	*45*
Implemented	*1*	*45*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

213

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Outdoor LED lighting project: Improvement: Employees in one of our Illinois warehouses implemented a project to reduce energy consumption, while also leveraging a local utility's incentivized efficiency program. The Sustainable Lighting Solutions were installed by an ICC Certified Energy Efficiency Service Provider for new LED fixtures and retrofits. Outcome: In the coming year, the project is estimated to save nearly 75% in energy annually, with a payback period of less than one year.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Other, please specify **:**Harmonic Energy Filter

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

45

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Case Study: Harmonic Energy Filter Improvement: The facilities team at C.H. Robinson headquarters installed new energy filter devices that capture harmonic frequencies from a site's electrical system, removing unnecessary heat and fluctuations to save energy. Outcome: In a proof-of-concept test, the devices saved 5.6% on total kWh used, and proved an ROI of less than 3 years.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Green Teams identify opportunities for internal sustainability, including awareness in local offices. For example, Earth Week provided opportunities for employees to impact our Scope 1 and 2 emissions.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Have resources focused on developing carbon-related/sustainability products for customers

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Budget dedicated to the purchase of RECs, year over year. This is across multiple divisions for both warehouses and offices.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Budget dedicated to energy efficiency audits and subsequent improvements. We are evaluating projects in partnership with our facilities and real estate team.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 2

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Sustainable Packaging Coalition

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Robinson fresh clients have the opportunity to work with us to create sustainable and/or recyclable packaging for the produce products. For example, we have partnered with Apeel to offer products with two to three times the shelf life for organic and conventional products. This provides benefits to growers, packers, distributors, and retailers —especially as it's the only plant-derived, end-to-end solution of its kind. Apeel adds a layer of plant-derived protection to the surface of fresh produce to slow water loss and oxidation—factors that cause spoilage. This dramatically cuts waste and offers premium products to shoppers and their families.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Global Logistics Emissions Council

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other, please specify **:**Emissions IQ Reporting, Supply Chain Inspection Report - Sustainability Profile

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

As a third-party logistics company, we work with customers to create more efficient supply chains including reducing empty miles and optimizing shipments and modes. Our solutions include shifting up to most efficient modes where possible and thus effectively reducing costs and transportation related emissions. We also provide Network Study consultative services which help minimize network assets, inventory and transportation miles and show customers opportunities for reducing carbon from their supply chain. Other services include container optimization consultative services which help enhance the effective use of case pack, pallet optimization and trailer optimization. Increasing the utilization of shipping containers influences the total number of shipments needed. As a member of the EPA's SmartWay program (since October 2005) our clients get the additional benefits of our SmartWay certified carriers. We have also launched Emissions IQ, an emissions calculator that provides customers with free emissions information on their shipments with us.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

	Targets in place
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ No
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ No
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ No
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ No
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ No
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party	Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party	Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :Underway for 2025	*We intend to verify Scope 3 data in 2025.*

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief HR and ESG Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
[Fixed row]