



Ingersoll Rand Inc.

# 2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

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.

[Read full terms of disclosure](#)

# 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

*Ingersoll Rand Inc. (NYSE:IR), driven by an entrepreneurial spirit and ownership mindset, is committed to helping make life better. We provide innovative and mission-critical industrial, energy, and medical products and services across 40+ respected brands designed to excel in even the most complex and harsh conditions where downtime is especially costly. Our employees connect to customers for life by delivering proven expertise, productivity and efficiency improvements. Gardner Denver Holdings, Inc. merged with the Ingersoll Rand Industrial segment February 29, 2020. The newly combined company, named Ingersoll Rand Inc. ("Ingersoll Rand"), began trading March 2, on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol "IR." The merger of Gardner Denver and Ingersoll Rand Industrial positions the new Ingersoll Rand as a global leader in mission-critical flow creation and industrial technologies. The combined company produces mission-critical flow creation systems, including air compressors, pumps, blowers, and systems for fluid management, loading and material handling. To support our customers and market presence, we maintain significant global scale with 66 key manufacturing facilities, approximately 40 complementary service and repair centers across six continents and approximately 21,000 employees worldwide as of December 31, 2024. Ingersoll Rand is committed to operating sustainably in a way that safeguards our employees and minimizes our environmental impact. Our ongoing commitment to safety and sustainability is embedded in our business practices and reflected in our belief that our long-term success will be measured by financial performance and by a continued focus on improving the life of our customers, employees, suppliers, shareholders and the communities. Our purpose, "Lean on us to help you make life better," was created with employees from every region joining together for intentional dialogue and rigorous workshops. Ingersoll Rand operates as 2 segments: 1. Industrial Technologies and Services- The Industrial Technologies and*

Services segment includes a combination of the Ingersoll Rand Industrial Compression Technologies and Services (CTS) business and the Gardner Denver Industrials business, which is managed through three regional business units, Americas, Asia Pacific and Europe, Middle East, India and Africa (EMEIA). Industrial Technologies and Services EMEIA includes Gardner Denver's EMCO Wheaton Fuel Systems and Runtech businesses. The Industrial Technologies and Services segment also includes: a) A new Pressure and Vacuum Solutions business unit that includes brands and offerings with a significant Engineered-to-Order (ETO) focus, including Nash, Garo, Ingersoll Rand Industrial Multi-stage Gear (MSG) Centrifugal Compressors, Gardner Denver Custom Engineered Products (CEP) and EMCO Wheaton Loading Systems. b) The Power Tools and Lifting business unit. 2. Precision and Science Technologies - This segment includes Ingersoll Rand's Industrial Precision Flow Systems (PFS) business unit as well as Gardner Denver's Medical business unit and Gardner Denver's Specialty Pumps. The Company continued its focus on generating inorganic growth through acquisitions that strengthen our position in core product categories and broaden our exposure to high-growth, sustainable end markets. Recent Acquisitions The Company continued its focus on generating inorganic growth through acquisitions that strengthen our position in core product categories and broaden our exposure to high-growth, sustainable end markets. In 2024, we closed on 18 acquisitions, which are expected to deliver approximately \$625 million in annualized revenue. The Air Treatment business offerings include energy-efficient compressed air dryers, filters, and other consumables that are highly complementary to Ingersoll Rand's core compressor equipment.  
[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.**

**(1.4.1) End date of reporting year**

12/31/2024

**(1.4.2) Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period**

Select from:

Yes

**(1.4.3) Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years**

Select from:

Yes

**(1.4.4) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 1 emissions data for**

Select from:

4 years

**(1.4.5) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 2 emissions data for**

Select from:

4 years

**(1.4.6) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 3 emissions data for**

Select from:

4 years

[Fixed row]

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

7235000000

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

**(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?**

Select from:

No

## ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

## CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

## Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

IR

## SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

## LEI number

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

## D-U-N-S number

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

## Other unique identifier

### (1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chile  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spain   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> China  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brazil  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> India  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canada  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Italy  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> France  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Japan  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mexico  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Finland |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sweden | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Germany |

- Austria
- Belgium
- Czechia
- Slovenia
- Viet Nam
- Australia
- Indonesia
- Singapore
- Taiwan, China
- Republic of Korea
- United Arab Emirates
- United States of America
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Ireland
- Colombia
- Malaysia
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Philippines
- Switzerland
- South Africa

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

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

Select from:

- Yes, for all facilities

### (1.8.2) Comment

*We continue to closely monitor our sites in the extremely high risk and high risk water-stress areas. We expect to adjust the coverage and the targets accordingly.  
[Fixed row]*

**(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities.**

**Row 1**

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Shandong-China*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*36.66826*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*117.02076*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 2

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Shanghai (Jiamei Road)-China*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*31.29412*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*121.32027*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 3

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Shanghai-China*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*31.230416*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*121.473701*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 4

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Wujiang-China*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*31.108888*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*120.680885*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 5

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*RD-Shanghai-China*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*31.00052*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*121.379391*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 6

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Bahadurgarh (Plot 6)-India*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*28.691376*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*76.931406*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 7

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Bahadurgarh (Plot 83)-India*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

28.691376

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

76.931406

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 8

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Barcelona-Spain*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.51526

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.37083

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 9

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Halle-Belgium*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*50.754082*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*4.248554*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 10**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Naroda (Plant 1)-India*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*23.068586*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*72.653596*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 11**

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Naroda (Plant 2)-India*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*23.022505*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*72.571362*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 12

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Pune-India*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*20.593684*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*78.96288*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

## Row 13

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Wasquehal-France*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*50.672614*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*3.134647*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 14**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*RD-Bangalore-India*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*12.924485*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*77.601258*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 15**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Douai-France*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*50.367874*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*3.080602*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 16**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Sahibabad-India*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*28.672359*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*77.349131*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 17**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Burbank, CA-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*34.171771*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-118.299709*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 18**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Chennai-India*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*13.037336*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*80.21449*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 19**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Wuxi-China*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*31.49099*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*120.31237*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.5% water use reduction.*

**Row 20**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Miami Gardens, FL-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*25.916363*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-80.277517*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 21**

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Mocksville, NC-USA*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*35.894026*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*-80.561449*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

## Row 22

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-New Castle, DE-USA*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*39.638126*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*-75.608533*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

## Row 23

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Ocala, Florida-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*29.140914*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-82.186786*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 24**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Springfield, MO-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*37.208957*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-93.292299*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 25**

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Bad Neustadt Saale-Germany*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*50.329727*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*10.206442*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

## Row 26

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Heerlen-Netherlands*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*50.930876*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*5.950559*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

## Row 27

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Nuremberg-Germany*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*49.452102*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*11.076665*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 28**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Southern Pines, NC-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*35.174047*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-79.392254*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 29**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*RD-Hampton, NJ-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*40.632574*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-74.885003*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 30**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Alsip, IL-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*41.66499*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*-87.720648*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 31**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Clearwater, FL-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

27.965572

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

-82.795895

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 32**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Deerfield Beach, FL-USA*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

26.29838

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

-80.126355

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 33**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Frankfurt-Germany*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*50.110922*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*8.682127*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 34**

**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

*MFG-Ilmenau-Germany*

**(1.8.1.2) Latitude**

*50.68435*

**(1.8.1.3) Longitude**

*10.925473*

**(1.8.1.4) Comment**

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

**Row 35**

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Stutzerbach-Germany*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*50.634368*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*10.860821*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

## Row 36

### (1.8.1.1) Identifier

*MFG-Tuggerah-Australia*

### (1.8.1.2) Latitude

*-33.30905*

### (1.8.1.3) Longitude

*151.42813*

### (1.8.1.4) Comment

*The site's 2030 goal is a 2.0% water use reduction.*

*[Add row]*

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

### (1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Upstream value chain

### (1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

- Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

- Tier 2 suppliers

### (1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

*Ingersoll Rand's value chain mapping process relies on third-party platforms such as IntegrityNext and Carbmee. IntegrityNext's Platform assesses and monitors our suppliers for environmental, social, and governance (ESG) risks. We collect data on Suppliers' practices related to environmental protection, human rights and labor, anti-bribery and anti-corruption, health & safety, and supply chain responsibility. IntegrityNext uses a four-step validation process to ensure ongoing monitoring and compliance with sustainability standards. This process includes real-time scanning of public data sources, ESG self-assessments by suppliers, validation of certifications, and creation of a compliance profile that categorizes risk levels by color. This approach allows us to accurately determine each supplier's compliance status, with categories indicating green for approved, yellow for sustainability risks requiring corrective action, and red for high sustainability risks necessitating immediate action. We have also partnered with Carbmee to more efficiently map the emissions of our value chain. Carbmee's Environmental Intelligent System (EIS) helps us calculate scope 3 emissions to assess hotspots, carbon risks and reduction opportunities. The EIS platform provides a holistic carbon management solution that allows us to examine the carbon impacts of our products at each stage within our value chain. Emissions are calculated by combining emission factors created using the Ecoinvent database with data from our products Bills of Materials (BOMs). The platform also includes a scenario planner that allows us to make data-driven decisions towards emissions reduction by targeting carbon hotspots and collaborating with suppliers to implement effective strategies for reducing emissions. Ingersoll Rand's current value chain mapping process has a partial coverage scope, primarily targeting Tier 1 suppliers. In 2024, we assessed over 1,500 Tier 1*

suppliers, representing around 60% of our procurement spend. Recognizing the importance of deeper supply chain visibility, we are committed to expanding our mapping efforts.

[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?**

#### **(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping**

Select from:

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

#### **(1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping**

Select all that apply

Upstream value chain

Downstream value chain

End-of-life management

#### **(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped**

Select all that apply

Recycling

Waste to Energy

Landfill

[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)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

*Risk*

### Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

*Emerging Risk*

## Long-term

### (2.1.1) From (years)

5

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

Select from:

No

### (2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Long-term 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

*Select all that apply*

- Climate change

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

*Select all that apply*

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain

### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

- Full

### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

*Select all that apply*

- Tier 1 suppliers

### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

- Qualitative and quantitative

### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

*Select from:*

- Annually

### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

*Select all that apply*

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

### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

- 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

Commercially/publicly available tools

- Other commercially/publicly available tools, please specify :GCAM 6.0 NGFS Model; FEMA standards; 2023 XDI Gross Domestic Climate Risk Dataset; RCP 2.6, 8.5, and 2050 scenarios.

Enterprise Risk Management

- COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
- Enterprise Risk Management
- Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard
- Life Cycle Assessment
- Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :GHG Protocol

Databases

- Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards
- Regional government databases

## Other

- External consultants
- Internal company methods
- Materiality assessment
- Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis
- Scenario analysis

## (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

### Acute physical

- Drought
- Wildfires
- Heat waves
- Cold wave/frost
- Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

### Chronic physical

- Heat stress
- Solifluction
- Water stress
- Sea level rise
- Permafrost thawing
- Temperature variability
- Increased severity of extreme weather events
- Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
- Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

### Policy

- Carbon pricing mechanisms
- Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
- Changes to national legislation

### Market

- Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- Changing customer behavior

## Reputation

- Impact on human health
- 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

- Dependency on water-intensive energy sources
- Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

## Liability

- Non-compliance with regulations

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- Customers
- Employees
- Investors
- Local communities
- Suppliers

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

*Select from:*

- No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*For short, medium and long-term climate-related topics, including Risks and Opportunities, we utilized the TCFD framework to determine the severity of climate risks from a physical and transition risk perspective and integrated the risks and opportunities into the established company-wide Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) system. A physical risk assessment was performed to identify Ingersoll Rand's risk to sea level rise, flood, water stress, wildfire, heatwaves, and coldwaves.*

*Additionally, a third party interviewed personnel at Ingersoll Rand to identify transition risks and opportunities. We then used surveys to assign impact, likelihood, and velocity to those risks and opportunities in order to prioritize them, and then determined if there were strategies in place to monitor, manage, mitigate/enhance, and adapt to the impacts. Ingersoll Rand's response to the climate-related risks and opportunities utilizes the ERM process during which we meet with the ERM Committee to review all risks and opportunities and determine the critical few to focus on, and formally integrate the climate-related topics (risks and opportunities) into the ERM planning process reviewed more than once per year. Through our ERM system, we develop and implement countermeasures designed to reduce climate risks to an acceptable level based on the risk levels set and reviewed by our executive management team, the Audit Committee, the Sustainability Committee and our Board of Directors. We track all the risks through our ERM system and review regularly with the ability to take action at any time should the risk become inevitable. Our ERM system is reviewed regularly for effectiveness and updated as needed. The data is reviewed and actions are developed by the company through its annual MLB (Make Life Better) strategic plan and ERM process to stay on track to meet or exceed the publicly stated 2030 and 2050 goals. We have an Operationalizing Sustainability weekly review that covers all business units globally with accountability for specific impact plans to achieve the annual climate targets. In addition, our operationalizing sustainability strategy includes roadmaps to achieving the metrics primarily through implementation of site-specific GreenX Teams and specific tools to improve energy efficiency. Operationally, Ingersoll Rand is ensuring the resiliency of its organizational strategy with onsite solar installations, purchasing renewable energy, introducing Virtual Power Purchase Agreements and other site-specific energy efficiency projects. Ingersoll Rand has business continuity plans in place to successfully execute on the organizational strategy as various climate scenarios take place. These business continuity plans ensure Ingersoll Rand will be able to supply energy efficient products to help achieve global climate goals.*

## Row 2

### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

*Select all that apply*

- Water

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

*Select all that apply*

- Dependencies
- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- Direct operations

- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- Full

#### (2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

#### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- Annually

#### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

- 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

Commercially/publicly available tools

- WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

- COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
- Enterprise Risk Management
- Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

Other

- Other, please specify :WRI database

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- Drought
- Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- Heat waves
- Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

#### Chronic physical

- Water stress
- Sea level rise
- Coastal erosion
- Groundwater depletion
- Increased severity of extreme weather events

- Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
- Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

#### Policy

- Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards

#### Technology

- Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products
- Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- Customers
- Employees
- Investors
- Suppliers
- Local communities
- Water utilities at a local level
- Other water users at the basin/catchment level

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

*Select from:*

- No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Ingersoll Rand achieved the water target of 17% water use reduction seven years early. We set a new annual risk-based goal for our manufacturing sites based on the individual water stress by location. Ingersoll Rand evaluated the water-stress areas and our affected locations. Based on this research, we selected high and very high-risk sites to contribute to the new water use reduction goal.

### Row 3

#### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Biodiversity

#### (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

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- Full

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- Every two years

### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

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

### (2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

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

### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

- Encore tool
- TNFD – Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures

Enterprise Risk Management

- COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework

- Enterprise Risk Management

#### Databases

- Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

#### Other

- External consultants
- Materiality assessment
- Scenario analysis

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

#### Chronic physical

- Change in land-use
- Declining ecosystem services
- Increased ecosystem vulnerability

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

#### Select all that apply

- Local communities
- Other commodity users/producers at a local level

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

#### Select from:

- No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*With respect to climate-related opportunities, our greatest opportunity is our energy efficient product portfolio that has the opportunity to dramatically help our customers reduce their GHG emissions. Ingersoll Rand's strategy for addressing climate change is most notable with its product efficiencies. Product improvements*

create new customer solutions resulting in improved downstream impacts, improved customer sustainability, and increased revenue. We know that nearly all of our customers now consider energy efficiency when making decisions, and governments around the world are now regulating energy conservation standards for compressors. We embrace this trend and aim to remain at the forefront of these requirements with 100% of our new product innovation designed with energy efficiency improvements. This is how Ingersoll Rand manages its contribution to the 1.5C scenario, which includes a 15% reduction in product use-phase GHG emissions. Energy efficiency is integral to our new product development process. Each new product includes an evaluation of total GHG emissions measured using a life-cycle assessment process. The opportunities created by this new product innovation are reflected in the annual MLB (Make Life Better) strategic financial plan developed by each of Ingersoll Rand's business units.

[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

Ingersoll Rand utilized KPMG to conduct a global Physical Risk Assessment of its material facilities in accordance with TCFD and determined sea level risk as a physical chronic risk using Climate EnVision Methodology, NOAA data sources and the Aqueduct Water Risk Analysis. KPMG conducted this assessment using temporal scenario planning including the current time frame as well as the years 2030 and 2050. The definition of sea level rise scope: Risk of coastal flooding at a given location in a given year; River Basin 5x5miles (USA) and 30x30miles (global) spatial resolution. The KPMG methodology is based on aggregating risk scores for assets in the Trucost dataset and visualizing the output on a PowerBI Dashboard. The model identifies at least 5 Trucost assets within a specified radii around the location that is being assessed (if 5 Trucost assets cannot be identified in the specified radii, the distance is expanded out gradually until the required number of assets are identified). The final output includes risk scores aggregated at the zip code level by each hazard type for each location assessed, and this output is then structured into a tabular schema and visualized using PowerBI. Ingersoll Rand's facilities were assessed for a low (RCP 2.6), moderate (RCP 4.5), high (RCP 8.5) impact scenario for each time horizon, but only considered one impact scenario per time horizon to simplify the output: 2020 – Low impact scenario 2030 – Medium impact 2050 – High impact Risk scores were grouped into the following categories: Low: Risk Score < 50 Medium: 50 <= Risk Score < 75 High: 75 <= Risk Score Because this method presents aggregated scores at the zip code level, scores are validated for the top material facilities using WRI's Water Risk Atlas tool for the exposures that are based on WRI data: sea level rise, rain and river flooding, and water stress. Results are then updated to reflect the WRI data if there are discrepancies. Under the 2050 temporal scenario, Wujiang, China was listed as "high risk and under the 2020, 2030 and 2050 temporal scenario, and New Orleans, Louisiana-USA was listed as "high risk." Wujiang is a manufacturing plant and New Orleans is a service center. The impact of not mitigating in time would be the loss of manufacturing and service capability in those two Ingersoll Rand sites in Wujiang and New Orleans. This would result in significant loss of revenue to the company.

[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

### (2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

- Areas important for biodiversity
- Areas of rapid decline in ecosystem integrity
- Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water
- Areas of importance for ecosystem service provision

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

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

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

*The first step of this assessment process is focused on understanding the underlying data for biodiversity intactness in the following four areas: Overall state of biodiversity in a given area Depletion in biodiversity Elements of habitat quantity and quality Does not reflect change Secondly, all 88 manufacturing sites (by address) were assessed for nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities. The results were spread across nine unique biomes with four priority biomes. Third, we determined the biodiversity intactness level for each specific site and associated biodiversity hotspots. The data was overlaid with biome identification and priority biomes to determine the number of facilities that are located in a priority biome and are in a biodiversity hotspot. 1. Temperate Broadleaf and Mixed Forests (18 locations) 2. Temperate Grasslands, Savannas and Shrublands (4 locations) 3. Tropical and Subtropical Moist Broadleaf Forests (1 location) 4. Tropical and Subtropical Dry Broadleaf Forests (3 locations)*

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

Select from:

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

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

Q2.3 priority map.pdf

[Fixed row]

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

### Risks

#### (2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- Qualitative
- Quantitative

#### (2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- Revenue

#### (2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- % decrease

#### (2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

- 1-10

#### (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- Likelihood of effect occurring

## (2.4.7) Application of definition

When identifying and assessing and responding to climate-related risks, Ingersoll Rand reviews risks according to probability and severity, both on an inherent (the impacts without considerations of countermeasures) and residual (impact after consideration of existing countermeasures) basis. Probability is measured across the short, medium, and long-term timeframes as defined in section 1.. Severity is measured by the potential cost impacts to annual sales and/or operations. The risk trend (probability of the severity increasing or decreasing over time) and risk velocity (how quickly would it occur, immediately or gradually) are also taken into consideration. A risk could be considered substantive should it have a total cost impact of at least 1-3% of annual sales and a likelihood of occurring within the next 5 years. The most substantive risks are ones that have a high likelihood of occurring in the next year and a total cost impact of at least 10% of annual sales.

## Opportunities

### (2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- Qualitative
- Quantitative

### (2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- Revenue

### (2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- % increase

### (2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

- 21-30

## (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- Likelihood of effect occurring

## (2.4.7) Application of definition

*The climate-related opportunities in priority order from high to low include: • Energy-efficient equipment • Sustainable end markets • Oil-free products and consumables • Clean energy-related products • Remanufacturing • Operational energy efficiency • Increased renewable energy use • Operational water use and operational waste. In 2023, 80 new products were launched with sustainable attributes and over 65% of our product portfolio includes products with sustainable attributes. Looking ahead, we anticipate that these types of products will contribute over 25% of our total revenue by 2030.*

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

- Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

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

*Ingersoll Rand requires all sites to evaluate local regulations and legal obligations. Included are water and storm water permits where the agency will classify the pollutants.. Sites are required to review their permit annually, add all legal obligations such as monitoring water pollutants to automated database. Our sites are required to monitor monthly and stay 50% below the legal requirement so as not to exceed a pollutant threshold.*

[Fixed row]

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

## Row 1

### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- Oil

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

*Oil is used in the manufacturing and servicing of our products. Oil contains toxins and heavy metals that can harm the environment and biodiversity.*

### (2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

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

Select all that apply

- Water recycling
- Resource recovery
- Upgrading of process equipment/methods
- Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
- Provision of best practice instructions on product use
- Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
- Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response
- Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
- Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*To manage, we collect and recycle oil or manage according to local law. We have procedures in place for spill clean-up within the facility to limit the exposure to groundwater.*

*[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

#### Water

##### (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:

Not an immediate strategic priority

### (3.1.3) Please explain

*Not a substantial impact on our organization or the environment*  
*[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

Policy

Carbon pricing mechanisms

##### (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*

Italy

Spain

France

Poland

Austria

Czechia

Germany

Ireland

Sweden

Slovenia

Netherlands

Switzerland

United States of America

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

*The potential financial impact of carbon pricing ranges from \$0-96M across Current Policies and Net Zero 2050 scenarios and is mostly concentrated in the United States and Europe (90% of total carbon pricing risk)*

### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

*Select from:*

Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

### (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 potential financial impact of carbon pricing ranges from \$0-96M across Current Policies and Net Zero 2050 scenarios and is mostly concentrated in the United States and Europe (90% of total carbon pricing risk).

### (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)

1000000

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

96000000

### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The financial effect was derived from the analysis of different climate scenarios. Based on the research and analysis conducted by the 3rd party partner, between 2024 and 2050, the total potential impact of carbon pricing may increase by up to 120x across the regions analyzed.

### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

More ambitious environmental commitments and policies

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

96000000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Similarly to financial effect figure explanation, the cost was derived from the analysis of different climate scenarios. Based on the research and analysis conducted by the 3rd party partner, between 2024 and 2050, the total potential impact of carbon pricing may increase by up to 120x across the regions analyzed.

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

*The data is reviewed and actions are developed by the company through its annual MLB strategic plan and ERM process to stay on track to meet or exceed the publicly stated 2030 and 2050 goals. We have an Operationalizing Sustainability IDM that covers all business units globally with accountability for specific impact plans to achieve the annual targets. In addition, our operationalizing sustainability strategy includes roadmaps to achieving the metrics primarily through implementation of site-specific GreenX teams and specific tools to improve energy and water efficiency. With respect to climate-related opportunities, our greatest opportunity is our energy efficient product portfolio that has the opportunity to dramatically help our customers reduce their Scopes 1 and 2 GHG emissions. Ingersoll Rand's strategy for addressing climate change is most notable with its product efficiencies. Product improvements create new customer solutions resulting in improved downstream impacts, improved customer sustainability, and increased revenue. We know that nearly all of our customers now consider energy efficiency when making decisions, and governments around the world are now regulating energy conservation standards for compressors. We embrace this trend and aim to remain at the forefront of these requirements with the goal of 100% of our new product innovation designed with energy efficiency improvements. This is how Ingersoll Rand manages its contribution to the 2°C or lower scenario.*

## Water

### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk2

### (3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

Other acute physical risk, please specify :Sea level rise

### (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

China

India

Australia

Netherlands

- France
- Belgium
- Germany

- United States of America

### (3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Meuse
- Rhine
- Godavari
- Elbe River
- James River
- Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)
- Other, please specify :Additional river basins: Besòs Llobregat Saale Sabarmati Bhima Lys Cauvery Scheldt Los Angeles Cooum Adyar Biscayne Yadkin Oklawaha White River Franconian Pegnitz Illinois Tampa Bay Watershed, Hillsboro Ilm Tuggerah, China Coast-Lake Tail Hu
- St. Lawrence
- Cauvery River
- Delaware River
- Cape Fear River
- Ganges - Brahmaputra

### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Ingersoll Rand utilized KPMG to conduct a global Physical Risk Assessment of its material facilities in accordance with TCFD and determined sea level risk as a physical chronic risk using Climate EnVision Methodology, NOAA data sources and the Aqueduct Water Risk Analysis. KPMG conducted this assessment using temporal scenario planning including the current time frame as well as the years 2030 and 2050. The definition of sea level rise scope: Risk of coastal flooding at a given location in a given year; River Basin 5x5miles (USA) and 30x30miles (global) spatial resolution. The KPMG methodology is based on aggregating risk scores for assets in the Trucost dataset and visualizing the output on a PowerBI Dashboard. The model identifies at least 5 Trucost assets within a specified radii around the location that is being assessed (if 5 Trucost assets cannot be identified in the specified radii, the distance is expanded out gradually until the required number of assets are identified). The final output includes risk scores aggregated at the zip code level by each hazard type for each location assessed, and this output is then structured into a tabular schema and visualized using PowerBI. Ingersoll Rand's facilities were assessed for a low (RCP 2.6), moderate (RCP 4.5), high (RCP 8.5) impact scenario for each time horizon, but only considered one impact scenario per time horizon to simplify the output.

### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Disruption in production capacity

### (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:

More likely than not

### (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

*Because this method presents aggregated scores at the zip code level, scores are validated for the top material facilities using WRI's Water Risk Atlas tool for the exposures that are based on WRI data: sea level rise, rain and river flooding, and water stress. Results are then updated to reflect the WRI data if there are discrepancies. Under the 2050 temporal scenario, Wujiang, China was listed as "high risk and under the 2020, 2030 and 2050 temporal scenario, and New Orleans, Louisiana-USA was listed as "high risk." Wujiang is a manufacturing plant and New Orleans is a service center. The impact of not mitigating in time would be the loss of manufacturing and service capability in those two Ingersoll Rand sites in Wujiang and New Orleans. This would result in significant loss of revenue to the company.*

### (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)

417400000

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

417400000

### (3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

*The total revenue from Ingersoll Rand's sites (Wujiang, China and New Orleans, LA-USA) in areas of high water stress is \$417,400,000. Therefore, if those high risk sites, were to be impacted by sea level rise and completely destroyed, in the worst case scenario, the total loss of revenue from these locations would be \$417,400,000 annually.*

### (3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

Establish site-specific targets

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

20000000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*2 properties are in the high risk category: (Wujiang, China and New Orleans, LA-USA).  
For the Wujiang location, the production would be shifted to a new facility or to an under-utilized facility within the region. The cost of relocation for Wujiang is between \$18M and \$20M. The relocation cost includes evaluation of new properties, moving production equipment, design and installation of new test stands, assembly stations, and offices, contract labor to build and/or modify a new or existing facility, and other miscellaneous costs. While we have taken measures and set goals to mitigate the impact from increased water stress in these areas, we anticipate that we would still need to spend \$20M to completely move production out of Wujiang to address the impact of increased water levels.*

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

*For the service location in New Orleans, the service center could easily move to a 100% remote operation and no facility would be needed. This conclusion is based on a periodic evaluation that IR performs on its service facilities in North America, including the New Orleans, LA location, that reviews the possibility of combining, relocating and/or moving to a remote operations. The actions required to transition to a remote operation include parts shipped directly to customers or a hub, Service Technicians deploying to customer sites from home, Service Coordinators, Sales Engineers and Management working from home to support customer requests. IR regularly reviews this analysis for implementation of the strategy. The timescale of implementation is within 1 year. As part of the last service center review, we determined there would be no anticipated loss of revenue or cost of mitigation. In both scenarios, the risk is not imminent and with proper planning, it is not a significant risk to Ingersoll Rand. Our resilient strategy allows time to address water stress risks and develop site-specific mitigation strategies in response, which could include shifting production to non-stressed areas, water reclamation, rainwater harvesting, and process efficiency improvements.*  
[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)

96000000

### (3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

1000000

### (3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

*As stated in question 3.1.1, the potential financial impact of carbon pricing ranges from \$0-96M across current policies and Net Zero 2050 scenarios and is mostly concentrated in the United States and Europe (90% of total carbon pricing risk)*

## Water

### (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)

417400000

### (3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

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

417400000

### (3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

### (3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

*Ingersoll Rand utilized KPMG to conduct a global Physical Risk Assessment of its material facilities in accordance with TCFD and determined sea level risk as a physical chronic risk using Climate EnVision Methodology, NOAA data sources and the Aqueduct Water Risk Analysis. KPMG conducted this assessment using temporal scenario planning including the current time frame as well as the years 2030 and 2050. The definition of sea level rise scope: Risk of coastal flooding at a given location in a given year; River Basin 5x5miles (USA) and 30x30miles (global) spatial resolution. The KPMG methodology is based on aggregating risk scores for assets in the Trucost dataset and visualizing the output on a PowerBI Dashboard. The model identifies at least 5 Trucost assets within a specified radii around the location that is being assessed (if 5 Trucost assets cannot be identified in the specified radii, the distance is expanded out gradually until the required number of*

assets are identified). The final output includes risk scores aggregated at the zip code level by each hazard type for each location assessed, and this output is then structured into a tabular schema and visualized using PowerBI. Ingersoll Rand's facilities were assessed for a low (RCP 2.6), moderate (RCP 4.5), high (RCP 8.5) impact scenario for each time horizon, but only considered one impact scenario per time horizon to simplify the output: 2020 - Low impact scenario 2030 - Medium impact 2050 - High impact Risk scores were grouped into the following categories:  
Low: Risk Score < 50  
Medium: 50 <= Risk Score < 75  
High: 75 <= Risk Score  
Because this method presents aggregated scores at the zip code level, scores are validated for the top material facilities using WRI's Water Risk Atlas tool for the exposures that are based on WRI data: sea level rise, rain and river flooding, and water stress. Results are then updated to reflect the WRI data if there are discrepancies. Under the 2050 temporal scenario, Wujiang, China was listed as "high risk and under the 2020, 2030 and 2050 temporal scenario, and New Orleans, Louisiana-USA was listed as "high risk." Wujiang is a manufacturing plant and New Orleans is a service center. The impact of not mitigating in time would be the loss of manufacturing and service capability in those two Ingersoll Rand sites in Wujiang and New Orleans. This would result in a significant loss of revenue to the company.

[Add row]

### (3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?

#### Row 1

##### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Benin

Other, please specify :38 locations specified in prior question. Not all basins available in drop-down.

##### (3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

Direct operations

##### (3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

38

##### (3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

1-25%

### (3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

1-10%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*This is an estimated percentage. We set a new annual risk-based goal for our manufacturing sites based on the individual water stress by location. Ingersoll Rand evaluated the water-stress areas and our affected locations. Based on this research, we selected high and very high-risk sites to contribute to the new water use reduction goal and mitigation of risks. We set goals of: 2.5% annual water use reduction for extremely high-risk sites. 2.0% annual water use reduction for high-risk sites. In total, we calculated a 30% water-use reduction goal to be achieved by 2030.*

[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	N/A

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Products and services

Other products and services opportunity, please specify :Development and/or expansion of low emission goods and services

#### (3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

- Downstream value chain

### (3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- China
- India
- France
- Germany
- New Zealand
- United States of America

### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*Hydrogen compressors*

### (3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

### (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-high

#### (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

*Through internal market research and forecasting, we have identified one key segment of the hydrogen power market in which Ingersoll Rand products can play an important role in climate change: (1) Industrial hydrogen compressors (calculated potential impact = \$100,000,000 with a minimum expected impact of \$10,000,000). We see the possibility of \$20,000,000 increase in revenue in the medium-term if we were to realize the opportunity related to this opportunity. On the high end, Ingersoll Rand could potentially see an increase of \$300,000,000 from expanding our offerings across the global Industrial hydrogen compressors market.*

#### (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)

20000000

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

300000000

#### (3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*Through internal market research and forecasting, we have identified one key segment of the hydrogen power market in which Ingersoll Rand products can play an important role in climate change: (1) Industrial hydrogen compressors (calculated potential impact = \$100,000,000 with a minimum expected impact of \$10,000,000). We see the possibility of \$20,000,000 increase in revenue in the medium-term if we were to realize the opportunity related to this opportunity. On the high end, Ingersoll Rand could potentially see an increase of \$300,000,000 from expanding our offerings across the global Industrial hydrogen compressors market.*

#### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

5000000

#### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Ingersoll Rand is investing significantly into R&D product development to further increase the number of and quality of offerings in the hydrogen market. In our current forecasting, we expect to spend up \$5,000,000 in additional product development to be able to realize this opportunity.*

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*Ingersoll Rand is investing significantly into R&D product development to further increase the number of and quality of offerings in the hydrogen market. In our current forecasting, we expect to spend up \$5,000,000 in additional product development to be able to realize this opportunity.*

## Water

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

*Select from:*

Opp1

### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Reputational capital

Reputational benefits resulting in increased demand for products/services

### (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*

China

Germany

India

United States of America

### (3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- Other, please specify :38 locations in water-stress areas named in previous questions.

### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*In 2023, we achieved our water target of 17% water use reduction 7 years early. This year, we are announcing a new goal centered on reducing water in water-stressed areas of the world, and believe we can achieve another 30% in absolute water reduction in water-stressed sites from 2020 to 2030.*

### (3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- Reduced indirect (operating) costs

### (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:

- 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

*In total, we calculated a 30% water-use reduction goal to be achieved by 2030. We have not calculated the financial impact of the realized opportunity. The baseline may change as new acquisitions are entered.*

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

Select from:

No

### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*As a part of discovery, we determined which locations are within water-stressed areas. The cost and financial implications of implementations of various solutions such as closed loop and other water consumption reduction solutions are to be calculated.*

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*We set goals of 2.5% annual water use reduction for extremely high-risk sites and 2.0% annual water use reduction for high-risk sites.*

## Climate change

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

Opp2

### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify :Development and/or expansion of air compression systems

### (3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

Downstream 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

*Customer-driven demand for more energy efficient air compressor system options*

### (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:

High

### (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

*Ingersoll Rand manufactures air compressors for multinational industrial firms of which nearly 100% have set carbon reduction goals. Our current generation of air compressors and dryers are significantly more energy efficient than the previous generations and many of our product offerings are more energy efficient than our competitors. As customers set more ambitious and aggressive reduction goals, we expect to see an increase in demand for our more efficient air compression system and audit service options. Additionally, Ingersoll Rand offers “air audits” to pinpoint and remediate leaks, under- or over-sized machines, piping, and/or storage, and component failures to meet the demand for more sophisticated services within compressed air systems (e.g., complete system modelling via digital twins). As we*

observe growing customer expectations for products with decreased carbon utilization and contribution to the reduction of overall carbon footprint of our products and operations, we respond with a sound plan in which we address these requirements and expectations by appropriate certifications, efficiencies in products and utilization of cleaner technologies. The timescale of implementation is less than 5 years.

#### (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)

215000000

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

215000000

#### (3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

*Through internal market research and forecasting, we have identified a number of products that we produce that are more energy efficient than our competitors and areas in which we expect to see an increase in customer driven greenhouse gas, ESG, or sustainability targets. These include the industries of logistics and transportation, wastewater treatment, paper production, and other industries such as carbon capture, solar, and lithium battery production. We could expect an average of \$215,000,000 million increase in revenue over the next 5 years.*

#### (3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

30000000

#### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*To ensure Ingersoll Rand maintains its edge in product efficiency, we will need to make further investments in our product offerings and potentially make acquisitions to support these business units. We have forecasted approximately \$30,000,000 of investment would be needed to realize this opportunity. Our strategy to realization of the opportunity involves continuous development of more energy-efficient air compressors, dryers and compressed air management systems. The timescale of implementation is less than 5 years*

#### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*As an example, we implemented a Design for Sustainability program for the Contact Cooled Rotary compressors sold in all regions of the world. The opportunities identified for energy efficiency included a 10% increase over a 10-year period. Our Design for Sustainability program is fully implemented with the expectation for 100% of our new product introductions following the Design for Sustainability methodology to identify energy efficiency improvements as well as circularity benefits for our customers and the planet.*

*[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.**

## Climate change

### (3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

Revenue

### (3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

600000000

### (3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

1-10%

### (3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

*High level estimation*

## Water

### (3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

Revenue

**(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)**

1

**(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue**

*Select from:*

Less than 1%

**(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures**

*High level estimation*

*[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:

Annually

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

Select all that apply

Executive directors or equivalent

Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

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

Select from:

Yes, and it is publicly available

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

*Commitment to Diversity- Board of Directors A key principle of the Company's Board member selection process is to strive to have a diverse Board of Directors. A critical factor that the Board and the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee carefully consider when assessing potential director candidates is the importance to the Company of ethnic and gender diversity in board composition. As set forth in the Company's Corporate Governance Guidelines, the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee and the Board are required to consider, and to request that any search firm hired by it consider, highly qualified women and diverse candidates as part of any director search process. The Board's commitment to this focus on Board diversity has resulted in a Board where seven of eleven of*

its current members (64%) are diverse, including four who are female and four who are ethnically diverse. In addition, Board members actively participate as mentors and panel speakers in quarterly events hosted by the Company's inclusion groups.

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

*Ingersoll-Rand-2024-Proxy.pdf, Ingersoll-Rand-2024-Proxy.pdf*  
 [Fixed row]

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

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

**(4.1.2) 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 chair
- General Counsel
- Director on board
- Other C-Suite Officer
- Board-level committee

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

#### (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

- Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding annual budgets                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing the setting of corporate targets                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring progress towards corporate targets                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving corporate policies and/or commitments                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes        |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan     |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures |  |

- Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements
- Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
- Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*Our Board reviews and provides oversight with respect to material economic, environmental, and social topics and their impacts, risks, and opportunities. The Board works to ensure that all topics material to the company and their impacts are addressed appropriately, including overseeing our Lead Sustainability strategy and our ERM process. This oversight is accomplished through the Board's committees, as more fully described in the 2023 annual report, as well as through reporting from management.*

## Water

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

*Select all that apply*

- Board chair
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- General Counsel
- Director on board
- Other C-Suite Officer
- 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*

- Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
- Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
- Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
- Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
- Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*Our Board reviews and provides oversight with respect to material economic, environmental, and social topics and their impacts, risks, and opportunities. The Board works to ensure that all topics material to the company and their impacts are addressed appropriately, including overseeing our Lead Sustainability strategy and our ERM process. This oversight is accomplished through the Board's committees, as more fully described in the 2023 annual report, as well as through reporting from management.*

### Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

- Board chair
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- General Counsel

- Director on board
- Other C-Suite Officer
- 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

- Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding annual budgets   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving corporate policies and/or commitments  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy                                    |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures                                   |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments                                 |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan                              |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities |  |

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*Our Board reviews and provides oversight with respect to material economic, environmental, and social topics and their impacts, risks, and opportunities. The Board works to ensure that all topics material to the company and their impacts are addressed appropriately, including overseeing our Lead Sustainability strategy and our ERM process. This oversight is accomplished through the Board's committees, as more fully described in the 2023 annual report, as well as through reporting from management.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

#### Climate change

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

Select from:

Yes

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Experience

- Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
- Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
- Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition
- Active member of an environmental committee or organization

## Water

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Experience

- Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
- Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
- Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition
- Active member of an environmental committee or organization

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

### Climate change

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

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- 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 public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements
- Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

## Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

## Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a climate transition plan
- Implementing a climate transition plan
- Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
- Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
- Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

## Other

- Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

### (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

*Annual board meetings and QBR (Quarterly Business Reviews)*

## Water

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

Executive level

- General Counsel

### (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 public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

## Strategy and financial planning

- Developing a climate transition plan
- Implementing a climate transition plan
- Conducting environmental scenario analysis issues
- Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- Quarterly

### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*Annual board meetings and QBR (Quarterly Business Reviews)*

## Biodiversity

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

Executive level

- General Counsel

### (4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Strategy and financial planning

- Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- Developing a climate transition plan
- Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

#### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- Annually

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

Annual board meetings

[Add row]

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

**Climate change**

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

12

**(4.5.3) Please explain**

*In support of our strategic imperatives including our “Lead Sustainably” strategy, our CEO, Executive Officers and Managers had a 2023 objective for achieving a 6% GHG emission reduction in their Performance Management Plans. An employee's achievement of the objectives in their Performance Management Plan is taken into account in determining their compensation. The increases in base compensation (which is 12% of total compensation for our CEO and 24% for our other c-suite officers) are linked to achieving specific goals including our sustainability metrics.*

**Water**

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

Select from:

No, but we plan to introduce them in the next two years

**(4.5.3) Please explain**

*Ingersoll Rand provides monetary incentives related to climate change, with a focus on greenhouse gas emissions reductions.  
[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**

Facility/Unit/Site management

Business unit manager

### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- Salary increase
- Other, please specify :monetary reward

### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

- Reduction in absolute emissions

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

Select from:

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

### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*An employee's achievement of the objectives in their Performance Management Plan is taken into account in determining their compensation.*

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

*Achieving a 6% greenhouse gas emission reduction in the Performance Management Plans annually will achieve our 2030 greenhouse gas emission 60% reduction target.*

## Climate change

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

Management group

#### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

*Select all that apply*

Salary increase

Other, please specify :Monetary reward

#### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

Reduction in absolute emissions

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

*Select from:*

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

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*An employee's achievement of the objectives in their Performance Management Plan is taken into account in determining their compensation.*

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

*Achieving a 6% greenhouse gas emission reduction in the Performance Management Plans annually will achieve our 2030 greenhouse gas emission 42% reduction target.*

**Climate change**

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

Senior-mid management

- Environmental, Health, and Safety manager

#### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

*Select all that apply*

- Salary increase
- Other, please specify :Monetary reward

#### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Emission reduction

- Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

- Energy efficiency improvement

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

*Select from:*

- Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*An employee's achievement of the objectives in their Performance Management Plan is taken into account in determining their compensation.*

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

*Achieving a 6% greenhouse gas emission reduction in the Performance Management Plans annually will achieve our 2030 greenhouse gas emission 42% reduction target. The incentives tied to the positions played a key role in enhancing emissions data accuracy for Scopes 1 and 2, improving reporting practices, and strengthening third-party verification, among other sustainability initiatives that lead us to the 2030 and 2050 goals.*

## Climate change

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

- Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Ingersoll Rand's NCO (Named Chief Officers)

### (4.5.1.2) Incentives

*Select all that apply*

- Salary increase

### (4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- Progress towards environmental targets
- Achievement of environmental targets
- Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index
- Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

Strategy and financial planning

- Board approval of climate transition plan

Resource use and efficiency

- Reduction in water consumption volumes – direct operations
- Energy efficiency improvement

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

Select from:

Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*In support of our strategic imperatives including our “Lead Sustainably” strategy, our CEO, Executive Officers and Managers had a 2024 objective for achieving a 6% GHG emission reduction in their Performance Management Plans. An employee’s achievement of the objectives in their Performance Management Plan is taken into account in determining their compensation. The incentives tied to the positions played a key role in enhancing emissions data accuracy for Scopes 1 and 2 improving reporting practices, and strengthening third-party verification, among other sustainability initiatives that lead us to the 2030 and 2050 goals. The increases in base compensation (which is 11% of total compensation for our CEO and 25% for our other c-suite officers, as specified in 2024 Proxy, p. 43) are linked to achieving specific goals including our sustainability metrics.*

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

*Achieving a 6% greenhouse gas emission reduction in the Performance Management Plans annually will achieve our 2030 greenhouse gas emission 42% reduction target. The incentives tied to the positions played a key role in enhancing emissions data accuracy for Scopes 1 and 2, improving reporting practices, and strengthening third-party verification, among other sustainability initiatives that lead us to the 2030 and 2050 goals. At Ingersoll Rand, the Board of Directors plays a central role in overseeing the company’s climate transition strategy and sustainability governance. The Board’s Sustainability Committee is explicitly tasked with reviewing and approving climate-related goals, including the company’s SBTi-verified emissions reduction targets and long-term decarbonization plans. This includes ensuring that climate transition plans are embedded into the company’s broader business strategy and capital allocation decisions. The Board also oversees the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) program, which includes climate-related risks and opportunities.*

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

### Row 1

#### (4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Climate change

#### (4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

#### (4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain

#### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*Ingersoll Rand is committed to operating sustainably in a way that safeguards our employees and minimizes our environmental impact. Our ongoing commitment to safety and sustainability is embedded in our business practices and reflected in our belief that our long-term success will be measured by financial performance and by a continued focus on improving the life of our customers, employees, suppliers, shareholders and the communities. You can Lean On Us to make Life Better! We are driven by an entrepreneurial spirit and an ownership mindset, inspiring us to care deeply about our neighbors and shared planet. Ingersoll Rand is committed to reporting regularly on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) matters through the Annual Sustainability Report and consulting stakeholders on ESG issues. To achieve a culture in which all employees and other interested parties are responsible for the environment, safety and well-being of each other, Ingersoll Rand is committed to integrating sound environmental, Our Employees Ensure safe work conditions and behaviors by acting responsibly and proactively. Consult with employees and worker's representatives on measures to implement to prevent accidents and injuries. In the event of an EHS incident, we take appropriate corrective actions to prevent recurrence at the specific location, as well as across the company. Provide EHS compliance training, including accident prevention and emergency planning and response, among others,*

#### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

#### Environmental commitments

- Commitment to a circular economy strategy
- Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

#### Climate-specific commitments

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

#### Social commitments

- Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
- Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

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

*Select all that apply*

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

### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

*Select from:*

- Publicly available

### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

00-001\_Rev 7 EHS 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

Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member

UN Global Compact

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

*Ingersoll Rand actively engages with GRI through staying updated on GRI's latest initiatives, publications, and events by subscribing to GRI's newsletters and following their social media channels; using GRI standards in Materiality Assessment process and annual ESG reporting. We advocate and support GRI's mission by promoting the adoption of the standards within our networks as it increases transparency and accountability. Ingersoll Rand has been a member of UN Global Compact since July 2022 and actively participates in disclosures and Communication on Progress.*

[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:

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

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

Select all that apply

Paris Agreement

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

*2024 Ingersoll Rand Sustainability Report.pdf*

#### (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

*Ingersoll Rand actively collaborates with various industry, economic, and environmental associations, as well as engages in partnerships, endorsements, and memberships with initiatives that are relevant to our business and hold significance for our employees and communities.*

*[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 a trade association

#### (4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

Other trade association in North America, please specify :US Department of Energy

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

Select all that apply

Climate change

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

Select from:

Consistent

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

Select from:

Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

*As a partner of DOE Better Plants, we comply with the partner's attempt to influence climate change. Through DOE's Better Buildings Initiative, more than 900 commercial, public, industrial, and residential organizations share their proven energy efficiency strategies and inspire others to tap into the continued potential for energy efficiency. Collectively, these organizations have saved 2.5 quadrillion Btus of energy, equivalent to \$15.3 billion, and 155 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. Partners have reduced their water use by 13.7 billion gallons. Together, partners represent more than 35 of the country's Fortune 100 companies, 10 of the top 25 U.S. employers, 14% of the U.S. manufacturing energy footprint, and 13% of total commercial building space, as well as more than 100 state and local governments spanning the nation. We are combating the climate crisis through meaningful energy, water, and waste reduction efforts. The Better Plants, Better Practice, and Better Project awards highlight innovation in industrial sustainability and a willingness to share good ideas. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) recently recognized Ingersoll Rand with a Better Practice Award for our West Chester and Sheboygan locations' initiatives.*

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

0

**(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
- Other, please specify :SASB

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

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water
- Biodiversity

#### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

- Complete

#### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Value chain engagement   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governance            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dependencies & Impacts   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emission targets      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity indicators  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emissions figures     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public policy engagement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risks & Opportunities |  |

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

pages 26-39

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

*2024 Ingersoll Rand Sustainability Report.pdf*

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*Ingersoll Rand's 2024 Sustainability Report outlines a comprehensive response to environmental issues beyond its GPP disclosure. The company addresses climate change through validated science-based targets, aiming for a 42% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030 and net-zero by 2050. It has achieved a 26% reduction since 2020 and powers 62 sites with renewable energy. For water, Ingersoll Rand surpassed its 17% reduction goal with a 38% decrease in absolute water use and is targeting a 30% reduction in water-stressed areas. On biodiversity, the company assessed 88 sites across nine biomes and integrates conservation into new construction projects. It also launched a biodiversity risk governance framework aligned with TNFD. Regarding deforestation, Ingersoll Rand committed to evaluating its value chain and aligning future goals with global standards. These efforts are supported by robust governance, supplier engagement, and transparency initiatives, reinforcing its purpose of "Making Life Better" through sustainable growth.*

*[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:

Annually

### Water

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

#### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Annually

[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

Physical climate scenarios

- RCP 2.6

### (5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

- No SSP used

### (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
- Reputation

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 1.5°C or lower

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

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

*Ingersoll Rand aligns with 1.5C temperature scenario. Ingersoll Rand facilities were assessed for a low (RCP 2.6) impact scenario for each time horizon, but only considered one impact scenario per time horizon to simplify the output: 2020 – Low impact scenario 2030 – Medium impact scenario 2050 – High impact scenario Risk scores were grouped into the following categories: Low Risk: Risk Score < 50 Medium Risk: 50 <= Risk Score < 75 High Risk: 75 <= Risk Score*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*Ingersoll Rand conducted an expanded scenario analysis of the physical and transition risk under the ISSB framework (formerly known as TCFD) that built on the prior work that covered only a small portion of our locations. In 2023, we expanded the coverage to 100% of Ingersoll Rand's existing facilities and those under construction. The study was executed to 1) Assess exposure of our supply chain to physical risks through priority seaport locations, 2) Identify the owned and operated assets most vulnerable to various physical hazards and quantify the potential impact of the overall physical risk, 3) Quantify the potential impacts of carbon pricing risk as a commonly assessed transition risk, 4) Use findings to inform development of climate adaptation and resilience strategies, and, 5) Improve climate-related disclosures using the results of the assessment. Our scenario selection represents a wide range of possible future states for both physical and transition risks. - Physical risk assessment: Assessed exposure to eight physical hazards related to climate change for 258 of Ingersoll Rand's owned and operated facilities and key supply chain locations. Quantified physical risks in terms of property damage and business interruption for 15 priority locations. - Transition risk assessment: Prioritized five regions for quantification based on the 2023 GHG inventory. Quantified the potential financial impact of carbon pricing in prioritized regions.*

## Water

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

WRI Aqueduct

### (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

Reputation

Liability

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

2030

2040

2050

### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

## Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Changes to the state of nature

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

*The results of climate related scenario analysis identified that overall climate risks are relatively low across our profile. Risk varies across region, time, and specific exposures, but some consistent “hot spots” emerge: (1) Risks from sea level rise, flooding, and coldwave are relatively low across Ingersoll Rand’s profile; (2) The Southwest is showing particularly high risks to water stress and wildfire; and (3) The Southeast shows risks related to heatwave. Two sites were impacted by sea-level rise and identified as “high risk”: Wujiang, China (2050 scenario) and New Orleans, LA-USA (2020, 2030 and 2050 scenarios) Our plan below outlines mitigation measures for controlling the physical high-risk properties. Sea-Level Rise: SVC-New Orleans, LA-USA: Relocate property or work remotely Sea-Level Rise: MFG-Wujiang-China: Flood-proofing, flood warning systems, flood preparedness; improve drainage systems, building or inflatable temporary flood barriers (e.g. water-gates, flood guards around windows), and shifting production to low-risk areas Furthermore, a new construction site in India which is located in a water-stressed area identified in our scenario analysis includes the following actions taken as a result of the information: Zero liquid discharge, rainwater harvesting, solar, and 100% electrification of the building envelope. The construction will be complete in 2024.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*When undertaking the scenario analysis, Ingersoll Rand seeks to understand the climate impacts of our global footprint. Additionally, IR wants to know how our business units will be impacted by climate, specifically sea-level rise.*

## 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:

- No SSP used

### (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
- Liability

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 1.5°C or lower

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2030
- 2040
- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Changes to the state of nature

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

*Ingersoll Rand aligns with 1.5C temperature scenario. IR facilities were assessed for a high (RCP 8.5) impact scenario for each time horizon, but only considered one impact scenario per time horizon to simplify the output: 2020 – Low impact scenario 2030 – Medium impact scenario 2050 – High impact scenario Risk scores were grouped into the following categories: Low Risk: Risk Score < 50 Medium Risk: 50 <= Risk Score < 75 High Risk: 75 <= Risk Score*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*In addition to the above, Ingersoll Rand utilizes a continuous ERM process that enables Ingersoll Rand to pursue its strategic mission while identifying, controlling and mitigating risks that are based on the COSO Enterprise Risk framework. The ISSB framework has been incorporated into the overall ERM process and is used by Ingersoll Rand to assess and manage climate-specific risks and opportunities. The Chief Risk Officer leads the ERM process, supported by a cross-functional Executive Committee that includes Ingersoll Rand's Chairman and CEO, Corporate Controller, Chief Information Officer, SVP HR, SVP General Counsel, SVP Strategy and Business Development, and VP Internal Audit. Input is also received annually by the Board of Directors to evaluate alignment of risk priorities between the Board of Directors and Management. The process includes risk identification through an annual review and update of the Ingersoll Rand Risk Register, Risk Analysis, and Risk Evaluation by a number of leaders throughout the business and functions to assess the prioritization of risk in the risk register based on the current countermeasures in place for the risk. The process also includes a third-party-led assessment of climate-related risks and opportunities utilizing the ISSB framework. Risk mitigation is developed by the subject matter experts/risk owners for those risks (including climate-related risks) that need additional countermeasures to bring the risk to an acceptable level. Monitoring by the Chief Risk Officer and the ERM Committee occurs on a quarterly basis. During these quarterly meetings, updates are provided on the status of new countermeasures identified by the committee or risk owners and to monitor the key performance indicators of the company's top risks as identified through the risk evaluation.*

## Climate change

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

IEA NZE 2050

### (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
- Liability

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 1.5°C or lower

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2050

#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Changes to the state of nature

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

*A transitional risk assessment was performed and interviews were conducted to identify climate-related risks and opportunities relevant to the business as the world transitions to a lower-carbon economy. Our assessment is based on potential scenarios for legislation, technological development or market conditions and is based on short-, medium- and long-term time horizons considering the expected lifetime of the assets or activities. These risks and opportunities were evaluated for likelihood, impact, and velocity and the final compilation of risks and opportunities was assessed through the ERM strategic process. Ingersoll Rand uses qualitative and quantitative climate-related transition scenario analysis. We used two scenarios from the International Energy Agency (IEA) for climate scenario analysis: Net-*

*Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario (NZE) and Stated Policies Scenario (STEPS). The scope of the assessment includes all our own factory operations globally based on our short, medium, and long-term climate-related risks and opportunities. The qualitative scenario analysis assessed the sensitivity of each risk and opportunity relative to each of the two scenarios and the associated level of impact. The majority of our risks have a larger potential impact in the STEPS due to them being more closely related to physical impacts (e.g., component shortages that may be exacerbated by supply chain disruptions). The majority of opportunities have a larger potential impact in the Net-Zero emissions by 2050 Scenario (NZE) due to Ingersoll Rand being able to supply products that aid in the transition to a lower-carbon economy (e.g., energy-efficient equipment and clean energy-related products). Transitioning to a lower-carbon energy-efficient economy involves both risk and opportunity for Ingersoll Rand. To that end, we will continue to monitor and mitigate risks that have an associated physical impact that can impact operations and disrupt Ingersoll Rand's supply chain. R&D investments in more energy-efficient, low-carbon technologies are planned to capitalize on potential opportunities.*

#### **(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario**

*A transitional risk assessment was performed and interviews were conducted to identify climate-related risks and opportunities relevant to the business as the world transitions to a lower-carbon economy. Our assessment is based on potential scenarios for legislation, technological development or market conditions and is based on short-, medium- and long-term time horizons considering the expected lifetime of the assets or activities. These risks and opportunities were evaluated for likelihood, impact, and velocity and the final compilation of risks and opportunities was assessed through the ERM strategic process. Ingersoll Rand uses qualitative and quantitative climate-related transition scenario analysis. We used risk ratings derived from the U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards which are used for pricing insurance policies in the U.S. This analysis looks at two extremes in Network of Greening the Financial System (NGFS) climate scenarios: Current policies and net-zero 2050. Climate Hazard Data was sourced from the 2023 XDI Gross Domestic Climate Risk Dataset which calculates the physical climate risk to the built environment in 2600+ territories around the world in RCP 8.5 and 2050. The scope of the assessment includes all our own sites globally based on our short, medium, and long-term climate-related risks and opportunities. The qualitative scenario analysis assessed the sensitivity of each risk and opportunity relative to each of the two scenarios and the associated level of impact. The majority of our risks have a larger potential impact in the STEPS due to them being more closely related to physical impacts (e.g., component shortages that may be exacerbated by supply chain disruptions). The majority of opportunities have a larger potential impact in the Net-Zero emissions by 2050 Scenario (NZE) due to Ingersoll Rand being able to supply products that aid in the transition to a lower-carbon economy (e.g., energy-efficient equipment and clean energy-related products). Transitioning to a lower-carbon energy-efficient economy involves both risk and opportunity for Ingersoll Rand. To that end, we will continue to monitor and mitigate risks that have an associated physical impact that can impact operations and disrupt Ingersoll Rand's supply chain. R&D investments in more energy-efficient, low-carbon technologies are planned to capitalize on potential opportunities.*

*[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

## (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

*In 2024, Ingersoll Rand conducted a comprehensive climate scenario analysis aligned with the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) framework, formerly known as TCFD. This analysis covered 258 owned and operated facilities and key supply chain locations, evaluating exposure to eight physical climate hazards—including riverine flooding, coastal inundation, surface water flooding, and extreme heat—across short-, medium-, and long-term horizons. The company used Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP 2.6 and RCP 8.5) and NGFS climate scenarios to model future conditions and assess both physical and transition risks. These included operational disruptions, property damage, supply chain interruptions, and regulatory challenges, as well as opportunities in energy-efficient technologies and sustainable markets. The scenario analysis directly informed Ingersoll Rand's climate strategy, which is anchored by Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) validation. The company has committed to a 42% absolute reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030 and net-zero emissions by 2050. For Scope 3 emissions—specifically Category 11 (use of sold products)—Ingersoll Rand targets a 64% intensity reduction by 2034 and a 97% reduction by 2050. As of 2024, the company had achieved a 26% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions, representing 61% progress toward its 2030 goal, and a 29% reduction in Scope 3 intensity, representing 46% progress toward its 2034 goal. One tangible example of scenario analysis driving action was the identification of high-risk sites for flooding, including Miami Gardens and Deerfield Beach in Florida, and several locations in China. In response, Ingersoll Rand implemented flood-proofing infrastructure, improved drainage systems, and developed relocation plans for critical operations. These measures were integrated into the company's Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) and Green Excellence (GreenX) operational sustainability programs, reinforcing climate resilience and supporting progress toward its SBTi targets. Overall, the scenario analysis results were embedded into strategic planning processes, including the Making Life Better (MLB) financial planning framework and quarterly ERM reviews. Climate-related risks and opportunities are now monitored by the Chief Risk Officer and reviewed by the Board's Sustainability Committee, ensuring that mitigation strategies and sustainability goals are aligned across all business units. This proactive approach demonstrates how Ingersoll Rand is operationalizing sustainability to meet its verified climate targets while enhancing long-term business resilience. In summary, some of the outcomes of the scenario analysis conducted by Ingersoll Rand, which included an expanded scenario analysis of physical and transition risks under the TCFD framework, were the expansion of coverage for Ingersoll Rand's facilities and those under construction. Our company assessed the exposure of our supply chain to physical risks through priority seaport locations, identified the owned and operated assets most vulnerable to various physical hazards, and quantified the potential impact of the overall physical risk. Additionally, we quantified the potential impacts of carbon pricing risk, a commonly assessed transition risk. We used those findings to inform the development of climate adaptation and resilience strategies, and, improve our climate-related disclosures using the results of the assessment.*

## Water

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

Select all that apply

Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

### (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

*Risk varies across region, time, and specific exposures, but some consistent “hot spots” emerge: (1) Risks from sea level rise, flooding, and coldwave are relatively low across Ingersoll Rand’s profile; (2) The Southwest is showing particularly high risks to water stress and wildfire; and (3) The Southeast shows risks related to heatwave. Two sites were impacted by sea-level rise and identified as “high risk”: Wujiang, China (2050 scenario) and New Orleans, LA-USA (2020, 2030 and 2050 scenarios). The outcomes of our analysis crystalized in outlining mitigation measures for controlling the physical high-risk properties as follows: Sea-Level Rise: SVC-New Orleans, LA-USA: Relocate property or work remotely Sea-Level Rise: MFG-Wujiang-China: Flood-proofing, flood warning systems, flood preparedness; improve drainage systems, building or inflatable temporary flood barriers (e.g. water-gates, flood guards around windows), and shifting production to low-risk areas Furthermore, a new construction site in India which is located in a water-stressed area identified in our scenario analysis includes the following actions taken as a result of the information: Zero liquid discharge, rainwater harvesting, solar, and 100% electrification of the building envelope. The construction will be complete in 2024.*

[Fixed row]

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

### (5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

### (5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

Yes

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

Select from:

Yes

### (5.2.5) Description of activities included in commitment and implementation of commitment

*Ingersoll Rand has developed a transition plan and we have underlined the initiatives and plans that are aligned to a 1.5C world. We developed business unit road maps based on collected projects from all locations globally. In accordance with 2030 and 2050 timelines, Ingersoll Rand is actively executing on our GHG emission reduction roadmap which includes site energy efficiency projects, refrigerant reduction, hybrid and electric fleet, retail renewable energy, onsite solar, building electrification, and a VPPA. Our transition plan is integrated into the overall company strategy. Ingersoll Rand utilizes a continuous ERM process that enables Ingersoll Rand to pursue its strategic mission while identifying, controlling and mitigating risks that is based on the COSO Enterprise Risk framework. The TCFD framework has been incorporated into the overall ERM process and is used by Ingersoll Rand to assess and manage climate-specific risks and opportunities. The Chief Risk Officer leads the ERM process, supported by a cross functional Executive Committee that includes Ingersoll Rand's Chairman, President and CEO, Corporate Controller, Chief Information Officer, SVP HR, SVP General Council, VP Strategy and Innovation, and VP Internal Audit. Input is also received annually by the BOD to evaluate alignment of risk priorities between the BOD and Management. The process includes Risk Identification through an annual review and update of Ingersoll Rand's risk register, risk analysis, and risk evaluation by a number of leaders throughout the business and functions to assess the prioritization of risk in the risk register based on the current countermeasures in place for the risk. The process also includes a third-party led assessment of climate-related risks and opportunities utilizing the TCFD framework. Risk mitigation is developed by the subject matter experts/Risk Owners for those risks (including climate-related risks) that need additional countermeasures to bring the risk to an acceptable level. Monitoring by the Chief Risk Officer and the ERM Committee occurs on a quarterly basis. During these quarterly meetings, updates are provided on status of new countermeasures identified by the committee or risk owners and to monitor the key performance indicators of the top risks of the company as identified through the risk evaluation.*

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

Select from:

Our climate transition plan is voted on at AGMs and we also have an additional feedback mechanism in place

### (5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

*Annual Investor ESG Meetings during which sustainability topics are discussed is an opportunity for all shareholders to engage with Ingersoll Rand's transition plan. All shareholders are invited to attend this meeting and have an opportunity to ask questions regarding the plan.*

### (5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

Annually

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

*Key assumptions: Market trends - Ingersoll Rand assumes that the market will continue to value sustainability and that there will be a growing demand for environmentally friendly products and services. This is reflected in the commitment to reduce GHG emissions and pursue energy-efficient projects. Technological Advancement: The company's roadmap includes the adoption of cutting-edge technologies like hybrid and electric fleets, onsite solar, and building electrification, reflecting an assumption that such technologies will be available, cost-effective, and reliable. Regulatory changes: The transition plan anticipates favorable regulatory support for companies making efforts to reduce their carbon footprint. This includes potential future carbon taxation, emissions trading schemes, and other regulations that would encourage or mandate reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Dependencies: Government policies: The transition plan is dependent on government policies that encourage or subsidize renewable energy, energy efficiency, and other green initiatives. Stakeholder cooperation: The involvement of various stakeholders like the executive committee and the board of directors (BOD)—shows a dependency on internal cooperation and alignment of visions for risk management and strategic initiatives.*

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

*Ingersoll Rand has made significant progress in advancing our transition plan to align with a 1.5°C world. The company has crafted detailed roadmaps for the business units, taking into account global projects, to meet the milestones we set for 2030 and 2050. Progress has been made in various areas: GHG Emission Reduction: The company is actively implementing its roadmap to cut greenhouse gas emissions. Key initiatives include improving energy efficiency at its sites, reducing the use of refrigerants, transitioning to a hybrid and electric vehicle fleet, sourcing retail renewable energy, installing onsite solar arrays, electrifying buildings, and engaging in a virtual power purchase agreement (VPPA). Integration with overall company strategy: The transition plan is fully integrated into the overall company strategy, ensuring that Lead Sustainably remains as one of the core considerations in all business decisions. Risk Management: Ingersoll Rand uses a continuous Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process, grounded in the COSO framework, to identify, control, and mitigate risks, including those associated with climate change. The TCFD framework is incorporated into this process, which helps the company to assess and manage climate-specific risks and opportunities. Executive oversight and involvement: The ERM process is led by the Chief Risk Officer and supported by a cross-functional Executive Committee. Annual input from the Board of Directors (BOD) ensures that risk priorities are aligned between the BOD and management. Risk assessment and mitigation: The company conducts an annual review and update of its risk register, analyzing and evaluating risks to prioritize them based on existing countermeasures. Subject matter experts develop mitigation strategies for risks requiring additional countermeasures. Monitoring and updates: The Chief Risk Officer and the ERM Committee monitor the company's risk profile on a quarterly basis, providing updates on new countermeasures and tracking key performance indicators of the company's top risks. Alignment with global standards: Ingersoll Rand has committed to internalizing the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact within its strategies, policies, and operations and is undertaking projects to advance the broader development goals of the United Nations, especially the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).*

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

*2024 Ingersoll Rand Sustainability Report.pdf*

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

*Select all that apply*

- Water
- Biodiversity

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

*Ingersoll Rand has developed a transition plan and we have underlined the initiatives and plans that are aligned to a 1.5C world. We developed business unit road maps based on collected projects from all locations globally. In accordance with 2030 and 2050 timelines, Ingersoll Rand is actively executing on our GHG emission reduction roadmap which includes site energy efficiency projects, refrigerant reduction, hybrid and electric fleet, retail renewable energy, onsite solar, building electrification, and a VPPA. Our transition plan is integrated into the overall company strategy. Ingersoll Rand utilizes a continuous ERM process that enables Ingersoll Rand to pursue its strategic mission while identifying, controlling and mitigating risks that is based on the COSO Enterprise Risk framework. The TCFD framework has been incorporated into the overall ERM process and is used by Ingersoll Rand to assess and manage climate-specific risks and opportunities. The Chief Risk Officer leads the ERM process, supported by a cross functional Executive Committee that includes Ingersoll Rand's Chairman, President and CEO, Corporate Controller, Chief Information Officer, SVP HR, SVP General Council, VP Strategy and Innovation, and VP Internal Audit. Input is also received annually by the BOD to evaluate alignment of risk priorities between the BOD and Management. The process includes Risk Identification through an annual review and update of Ingersoll Rand's risk register, risk analysis, and risk evaluation by a number of leaders throughout the business and functions to assess the prioritization of risk in the risk register based on the current countermeasures in place for the risk. The process also includes a third-party led assessment of climate-related risks and opportunities utilizing the TCFD framework. Risk mitigation is developed by the subject matter experts/Risk Owners for those risks (including climate-related risks) that need additional countermeasures to bring the risk to an acceptable level. Monitoring by the Chief Risk Officer and the ERM Committee occurs on a quarterly basis. During these quarterly meetings, updates are provided on status of new countermeasures identified by the committee or risk owners and to monitor the key performance indicators of the top risks of the company as identified through the risk evaluation.*

*[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

Upstream/downstream value chain

Operations

*[Fixed row]*

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

## Upstream/downstream value chain

### (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

*Ingersoll-Rand, like many industrial and manufacturing companies, has integrated environmental risks, especially those related to climate change, into their strategy for both the upstream and downstream value chains. Upstream (Suppliers and Inputs): Ingersoll Rand faced risks from increased regulations and expectations on the carbon footprint and sustainability of the materials and components they source. To mitigate these risks, we focused on sustainable sourcing, partnering with suppliers who prioritize low-carbon practices, and ensuring their supply chain complies with environmental standards. We also emphasized reducing energy consumption and emissions in our production processes to align with global climate goals and regulatory frameworks. Downstream (Products and Customers): On the downstream side, Ingersoll Rand's strategy adapted to help customers reduce their own environmental impact (like implementation of the new customer goal). Our company continues to develop energy-efficient products, such as climate control systems, and invest in innovation to meet the growing demand for greener, lower-emission solutions. As regulations on emissions tighten and customers seek to meet their own sustainability goals, Ingersoll Rand saw this as an opportunity to lead in energy-efficient and environmentally friendly products. Overall, Ingersoll Rand's response to environmental risks related to climate change is proactive, focusing on reducing emissions and energy use both within our own operations and throughout the value chain. This approach not only helps mitigate the risks but also provides opportunities to differentiate our products in an increasingly eco-conscious market.*

## Operations

### (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

Water

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

*Ingersoll Rand has addressed environmental risks and opportunities, particularly in the areas of climate change and water management, by aligning its operational strategies to mitigate risks and capture opportunities. Climate Change Risks and Opportunities: Ingersoll Rand recognizes the growing regulatory and market pressures related to climate change. These include tightening carbon emissions regulations, rising energy costs, and increasing demand for low-carbon technologies. As a result, the company has adopted several strategies within its operations: Energy Efficiency: Ingersoll Rand invested heavily in improving energy efficiency across its own manufacturing facilities. By reducing energy consumption, the company aims to minimize its greenhouse gas emissions, lower operational costs, and comply with global regulatory standards. Renewable energy: We has also explored renewable energy sources, incorporating more solar energy in our operations to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. This shift helps lower operational risks tied to carbon taxes and fluctuating energy prices while improving the sustainability profile of our operations. Carbon goals: Ingersoll Rand set ambitious goals to reduce carbon emissions within our own operations, including a commitment to become net-zero by 2050. This positions the company as a leader in sustainable manufacturing and provides opportunities to attract eco-conscious customers. Product innovation: A significant opportunity for Ingersoll Rand lies in the development of efficient products with sustainable solutions, and investing in high-growth sustainable end-markets such as life sciences, water, food and clean energy. The demand for such products is growing as businesses and governments seek solutions to lower their carbon footprints, which creates new revenue streams for Ingersoll Rand. Water risks and opportunities: Water scarcity and water quality concerns are critical environmental risks that Ingersoll Rand considers in its operations. Our strategy reflects the need to manage these risks while also improving sustainability. Water conservation: In water-stressed regions, Ingersoll Rand has focused on reducing water consumption in its manufacturing processes. This includes investments in water-efficient technologies, recycling, and reuse initiatives within the facilities to lower dependency on local water sources. Wastewater Management: The company has developed wastewater treatment processes that ensure minimal environmental impact, focusing on reducing pollutants and safely managing water discharge from its operations. This also helps reduce compliance risks related to water regulations. Sustainable manufacturing practices: Ingersoll Rand views water conservation as part of its broader sustainability efforts. By implementing advanced cooling and treatment systems that use less water, the company reduces both water footprint and operating costs.*

[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

### (5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

Risks

### (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

*Both risks and opportunities shape how Ingersoll Rand allocates resources, manages costs, and plans for long-term sustainability. It's essential for financial planners to incorporate these factors into their budgeting, forecasting, and investment strategies. Environmental risks include factors like climate change, natural disasters, and resource depletion. These can increase costs, disrupt operations, or lead to regulatory penalties. For example, Ingersoll Rand accounts for extreme weather that might damage facilities, requiring costly repairs, or stricter environmental regulations forcing to invest in greener technologies. Failing to account for these risks in financial planning can lead to unanticipated expenses or reduced revenue. Opportunities: On the other hand, there are environmental opportunities, such as adopting sustainable practices, which can improve efficiency, reduce costs, and enhance reputation. Ingersoll Rand recognizes that financial planning can also benefit from incentives or tax breaks for environmentally friendly initiatives.*

[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	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

Other, please specify :Alignment with our climate transition plan

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

CAPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

7852286

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

100

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

100

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

100

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

*Annually, the company issues climate goals in line with our 2030 and 2050 targets to the business units, which in turn are required of the individual sites. The sites routinely identify climate-related projects in the company's sustainability database and, once a year during the planning process, select projects for implementation*

the following year. Capital and expense money is approved in the month in which it was planned. Sites track their project implementation in the company's sustainability database against their stated climate goals.

## Row 2

### (5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

Other, please specify :Alignment with our climate transition plan

### (5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

OPEX

### (5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

1673084

### (5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

100

### (5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

100

### (5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

100

### (5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

Annually, the company issues climate goals in line with our 2030 and 2050 targets to the business units, which in turn are required of the individual sites. The sites routinely identify climate-related projects in the company's sustainability database and, once a year during the planning process, select projects for implementation

the following year. Capital and expense money is approved in the month in which it was planned. Sites track their project implementation in the company's sustainability database against their stated climate goals.

[Add row]

## **(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?**

### **(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D**

Select from:

Yes

### **(5.5.2) Comment**

*A significant portion of our products, offer resource efficiency benefits to our customers and consumers during their use-phase. Our products contribute to a range of positive impacts, including decreased energy and water consumption, reduced waste generation, lower greenhouse gas emissions, pollution reduction, decreased raw material consumption, and increased product durability and longevity. All new product development at Ingersoll Rand includes design for sustainability. Products under development or products being reconfigured are required to perform a quantitative comparative analysis to determine efficiency. We have more than 1,800 mechanical, electrical, and software designers and engineers developing innovative technologies and delivering products and services, many with sustainable attributes for our customers. Ingersoll Rand also holds over 2,099 active patents, with a remarkable 85% providing sustainability benefits. Lastly, Ingersoll Rand has ongoing product development and associated R&D within almost all product portfolios. Some examples of low-carbon product development are hydrogen compressors and refueling stations, hydrogen fuel cells, industrial hydrogen compression, biogas recovery compression systems, waste grinding and conveyance for biogas production, flare gas capture systems with zero methane emission, natural gas odorizer, blowers and vacuum pumps for captured carbon transmission for transport, blowers for air cushion for ocean vessels, reduce friction, less fuel consumption, efficient rotary and centrifugal compressors, blowers and vacuum systems, variable frequency drive motors to improve efficiency (compressor, blower, vacuum), dryers with low-GWP refrigerants, heat of compression dryers, heat recovery modules, controller upgrades for improved efficiency/ EcoPlant compression management, air system assessments and components to reduce system losses and save energy, electric Q-Drive compressors, electric-operated PD pump, Dosatron water-powered dosing pumps, RunTech systems, and cordless tools.*

[Fixed row]

## **(5.5.2) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for capital goods products and services over the last three years.**

Row 1

### (5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

Control systems

### (5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

Large scale commercial deployment

### (5.5.2.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

4

### (5.5.2.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

1

### (5.5.2.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

4.1

### (5.5.2.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

*Ingersoll Rand's investment in advanced onboard control technologies is a key driver of its climate commitments, enabling reductions in energy use, resource consumption, and carbon emissions. These intelligent systems—embedded across compressor and blower platforms—enhance operational performance while delivering measurable sustainability outcomes. Technologies like the MAESTRO Universal, Xe-145F Series, and IntelliFlow Electronic Flow Controller dynamically manage system performance by monitoring flow, pressure, and load conditions in real time. For instance, IntelliFlow creates a stored energy effect to meet high-volume demands without increasing system pressure, reducing both energy and maintenance costs. MAESTRO Universal and PLC-R2 controllers optimize centrifugal compressor performance by adapting to specific applications, preventing over-pressurization and unnecessary cycling. This stabilizes operations, lowers power draw, and extends equipment life—key factors in reducing emissions and supporting long-term sustainability. These controls also enable predictive maintenance by providing early warnings, real-time alerts, and actionable insights. This proactive approach minimizes resource use, extends asset life, and supports circular economy principles. Ingersoll Rand's CARE service programs integrate with these systems to deliver comprehensive asset management. Predictive analytics and remote monitoring help detect anomalies early, reducing downtime and operational risk. IIoT-enabled features allow for remote access, centralized control, and seamless integration across platforms. Real-time data visualization and automated reporting support ESG compliance and regulatory requirements. For example, the*

*iControl system uses distributed architecture for remote commissioning and maintenance, enabling centralized control and speed regulation. Depending on configuration, it delivers energy savings of 20–60%, directly contributing to Ingersoll Rand’s climate goals. These onboard control technologies are more than operational tools—they are climate-aligned innovations. By optimizing energy use, enabling predictive maintenance, and supporting digital integration, they help industrial users reduce emissions, conserve resources, and transition to more sustainable operations. This reinforces Ingersoll Rand’s leadership in delivering intelligent, low-carbon solutions that support both environmental and economic performance.*

## Row 2

### (5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

Machinery automation

### (5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

Small scale commercial deployment

### (5.5.2.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

1.8

### (5.5.2.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

1

### (5.5.2.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

5

### (5.5.2.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

*Ecoplant’s intelligent compressed air management platform exemplifies Ingersoll Rand’s climate commitments in energy efficiency, emissions reduction, predictive maintenance, and digital transformation. Using AI-driven analytics and remote monitoring, Ecoplant helps industrial facilities optimize compressed air systems, reduce waste, and enhance sustainability. At its core, Ecoplant’s dynamic AI engine analyzes production profiles—daily, weekly, and seasonal—to adjust compressor*

operations in real time. This reduces energy consumption, redundancy, and utility costs. For example, Danone's dairy plant in Israel saved \$215,000 annually, including \$50,000 in energy savings and \$150,000 from avoided downtimes and capacity losses—directly supporting Ingersoll Rand's emissions and energy intensity goals. Ecoplant also enables predictive maintenance by identifying potential failures before they occur, minimizing unplanned downtime and extending equipment life. In Ecolab's case, Ecoplant detected high leak rates and inefficient control, generating \$294,000 in annual value: \$52,000 from leakage reduction, \$32,000 in electrical savings, and \$130,000 from avoided downtime. Its cloud-based platform allows remote system management, reducing on-site interventions and improving agility. A customizable dashboard provides real-time insights into energy use, performance, and idle time, empowering data-driven decisions. Unlimited historical data and personalized analytics help track inefficiencies and equipment usage, aligning with Ingersoll Rand's focus on transparency and measurable impact. Ecoplant also supports ISO air quality standards and reduces reliance on backup compressors by stabilizing pressure and isolating leaks. In Danone's weekend operations, switching to smaller compressors led to 30% energy savings and \$25,000 in reduced electrical costs annually. By integrating energy efficiency, predictive maintenance, and digital intelligence, Ecoplant delivers tangible environmental and economic benefits. Its success in real-world applications like Danone and Ecolab demonstrates how Ingersoll Rand's climate strategy is being realized through smart, scalable technologies that empower industrial users to operate more sustainably.

### Row 3

#### (5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

Renewable energy

#### (5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

Full/commercial-scale demonstration

#### (5.5.2.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

0.6

#### (5.5.2.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

1

#### (5.5.2.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

1

### **(5.5.2.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan**

*Ingersoll Rand's blower and vacuum product development is a clear reflection of its commitment to climate action and sustainable innovation in energy and water savings, and waste recycling. These technologies are engineered to reduce environmental impact while delivering high performance and operational efficiency across a wide range of industrial applications. A central pillar of this alignment is energy efficiency. For example, the latest high-speed radial blower achieves up to 60% energy savings compared to traditional blower technologies. In one quantified use case (F-RB radial blower), this translates to 260 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions avoided and €152,000 in energy cost savings over 10 years. These improvements directly support global climate goals, including our targets for reducing energy consumption and achieving net-zero by 2050. Environmental responsibility is also embedded in the product design. The blower features an oil-less configuration, eliminating the risk of air contamination and removing the need for chemical water treatment. This not only supports water conservation goals but also simplifies maintenance and enhances process cleanliness. Additionally, the blower's compact footprint—with envelope reductions of up to 50%—reduces material usage and transportation emissions, contributing to more sustainable manufacturing and logistics. Digitalization further enhances the sustainability profile of these systems. The blower is IIoT-ready, enabling predictive maintenance, real-time monitoring, and smarter asset management, without the need of our service technicians to travel to customer sites. These features extend equipment life, reduce unplanned downtime, and minimize waste—key principles of a circular economy. Onboard protection systems and compatibility with frequency converters also support energy optimization and operational agility. These products are designed for versatility and adaptability, serving industries such as food and beverage, hydrogen fuel cells, textiles, and environmental aeration. Their ability to operate continuously and efficiently under varying load conditions makes them ideal for customers seeking to reduce their carbon footprint without compromising productivity. Ingersoll Rand also emphasizes transparency and measurable impact. Through detailed performance data and total cost of ownership tools, customers can quantify energy savings and emissions reductions, reinforcing the value of sustainable investment.*

[Add row]

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

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

#### (5.9.5) Please explain

*Our CAPEX and OPEX remain unchanged as we balance water-related capital and operational expenditure balances through our sustainability project system. We also continue to invest in product innovation and technology however they are not isolated to water-related. The data around the percentage of CAPEX and OPEX that is water-related is being reviewed and analyzed, and it has not been publicly disclosed.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

##### (5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

No, but we plan to in the next two years

##### (5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

No standardized procedure

##### (5.10.4) Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities

*In many cases, there's no clear market benefit for Ingersoll Rand to voluntarily price these externalities. Unless consumers or investors prioritize environmental responsibility, which Ingersoll Rand is acutely monitoring for possible implementation.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

Suppliers

### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

### (5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

## Customers

### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

### (5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

## Investors and shareholders

### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

### (5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

## Other value chain stakeholders

### (5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

- No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

### (5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

- No standardized procedure

### (5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

*Most value chain stakeholders with climate change engagement are our own operations, customers and suppliers. As we focus and develop processes and targets for engagement with those, we will review and widen the activities to encompass upstream and downstream sites, resources, etc.*

*[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
- Impact on pollution levels

### (5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

1-25%

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

*Using IntegrityNext, we assess supplier ESG risks by evaluating their responses to questions in areas like environmental protection and supply chain responsibility. Suppliers with high-risk assessment results are classified as having substantive impacts on pollution levels. Suppliers' contributions to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions are also used to define our threshold. Suppliers responsible for over 50,000 MT CO2e in one year are classified as having substantive impacts on the environment.*

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

Select from:

1-25%

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

242

[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
- Procurement spend

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*While we are committed to engaging all our suppliers on climate change, our initial efforts are strategically directed at those with the highest procurement spend. As of 2024, less than 7% of our tier 1 suppliers represent the top 80% of our procurement spend. This shows that a concentrated number of our suppliers have a substantial impact on our supply chain's operations and environmental performance. Our rationale for prioritizing suppliers using this criterion is based on the understanding that by engaging with those who represent a substantial portion of our procurement, we can deliver the most immediate and extensive environmental benefits across our supply chain. Additionally, we prioritize engagement with suppliers classified as having substantive impacts relating to climate change. Those designated as a 'red' or 'high risk' in IntegrityNext's risk assessment are the first we engage with to develop and implement corrective action plans. Our rationale for prioritizing engaging with our 'red' suppliers is our belief that addressing the most pressing environmental risks first will result in the greatest reductions in our supply chain's negative environmental impact. While we also establish corrective action plans for 'yellow' or 'medium risk' suppliers, our immediate focus is on 'red' suppliers due to their higher risk status.*

[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

*Ingersoll Rand's 'Supplier Non-Compliance Policy' reflects our proactive and collaborative approach to driving sustainability and ethical practices across our supply chain. Embracing a 'Retain and Engage' strategy, we commit to working with our suppliers to address non-compliance, providing clear guidance on appropriate corrective actions, and fostering continuous improvement to meet our shared environmental and social goals.*

*[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:*

- Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

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

*Select all that apply*

- 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:

100%

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

Select from:

100%

### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*This environmental requirement is stated publicly in Ingersoll Rand's Supplier Code of Conduct which states that "Suppliers are expected to identify, reduce, manage, and responsibly control Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions from their operations. Suppliers shall regularly set science-based targets for emissions reduction, monitor their progress, and work on reducing GHG emissions through conservation efforts." (Page 5 of Supplier Code of Conduct) <https://www.irco.com/en-us/company/sustainability/working-with-us/supplier-code-of-conduct>*

[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:

Upstream value chain transparency and human rights

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

##### Financial incentives

Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

Provide financial incentives for environmental performance

##### Information collection

Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

#### (5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

51-75%

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

Select from:

26-50%

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

*The IntegrityNext platform facilitates the annual collection of environmental risk and opportunity information. This engagement helps us classify suppliers based on their environmental risk levels, allowing us to prioritize those identified as high-risk for targeted improvements. By collaborating with these suppliers, we aim to reduce the overall environmental impact of our value chain, contributing significantly to climate change mitigation efforts. To further incentivize sustainable practices, Ingersoll Rand has integrated environmental performance into its preferred supplier and supplier recognition programs. Our preferred supplier program offers financial incentives such as preferential quoting of new business to suppliers that meet all criteria deemed as critical. Some preferred suppliers are rewarded through our supplier recognition program which highlights suppliers who excel in the areas of value management, sustainability, quality, most improved, and overall supplier of the year. IntegrityNext's assessments are used to determine whether suppliers meet our criteria for sustainability and can be included in these programs. By using IntegrityNext's assessments as a criterion for determining which suppliers are added to these programs, we are providing financial incentives for environmental performance and featuring environmental performance in our supplier awards scheme. The coverage of this engagement is partial, but we plan to expand the number of suppliers assessed by including sustainability as a criterion for evaluating which suppliers to include in these programs. In terms of the positive outcomes that have resulted from these activities, we have already seen a notable increase in upstream value chain transparency, which is crucial for identifying areas where improvements are most needed. We anticipate that by including sustainability as a metric for assessing our suppliers, we will create strong incentives for suppliers to adopt practices that contribute to climate change mitigation. Our measure of success for this engagement includes enrolling the top 90% of our significant suppliers within the IntegrityNext platform and reducing the percentage of high-risk significant suppliers to less than 10%. These metrics have been chosen to assess the effectiveness of this engagement activity because achieving these targets will help expand the coverage of our value chain mapping and our ability to improve the sustainability practices of our suppliers.*

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

Select from:

- Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Implementation of emissions reduction initiatives

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

Select from:

- Unknown

### Water

#### (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

[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 on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

## Innovation and collaboration

- Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

## Other

- Other, please specify :Publicly disclosed information, inclusive of scope 3 in annual sustainability reports.

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 51-75%

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

Select from:

- Unknown

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

*We leverage the extraordinary strengths of our company and our ownership mindset to deliver sustainable products and services to our industrial customers. With the goal of reducing the carbon footprint of our products, we have adopted DfS as a critical principle of our new product and service development processes. We define DfS as an approach that establishes the well-being of people and the sustainability of the environment as factors in developing new products or service offerings. Sustainability is also an important accelerant in our Economic Growth Engine. It is one of the three megatrends that we believe will drive continued growth throughout our businesses. As Ingersoll Rand continues to grow, we have made a conscious choice to ensure all new product designs go through our Design for Sustainability (DfS) process to deliver products and services that improve energy efficiency, circularity, and safety. In 2024, 180 new products were launched with sustainable attributes, and over 65% of our product portfolio includes products with sustainable attributes.*

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

*Based on customer demands, market changes and global sustainability efforts, we aim to explore new sustainable methods for product design, taking into account all aspects from the selection of materials and manufacturing process enhancements to in service operations and the recycling and remanufacturing of our products.*

## Climate change

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Investors and shareholders

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

Innovation and collaboration

- Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions
- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

Other

- Other, please specify :Publicly disclosed information, inclusive of scope 3 in annual sustainability reports.

### (5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 51-75%

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

Select from:

- Unknown

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

*Each year, Ingersoll Rand engages with its investors and stakeholders on sustainability matters through investor day, sustainability presentations, etc. We interact with the investors, analysts, and other stakeholders to gain their perspective, comments, and questions, as well as engage them in the materiality assessment process.*

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

*To measure success in engaging stakeholders and analysts on climate issues, Ingersoll Rand uses key areas and metrics to evaluate their effectiveness. These measures ensure that our communication and climate actions are understood, valued, and drive meaningful progress. We strive for clear and consistent disclosure of climate-related data and strategies, following recognized frameworks such as the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) or the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). The success is measured by the quality and completeness of the disclosures, stakeholder feedback on transparency, and alignment with investor expectations. Another area of success is measured by the positive ratings from environmental, social, and governance (ESG) analysts and rating agencies (like MSCI or Sustainalytics, DJSI and CDP), as well as public recognition and therefore increased trust and reputation of the company.*

*[Add 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

*Locations within Ingersoll Rand's (IR) Environmental Inventory have full authority to introduce and implement operating policies, though many locations are leased.*

### Water

#### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

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

*Locations within Ingersoll Rand's (IR) Environmental Inventory have full authority to introduce and implement operating policies, though many locations are leased.*

### Plastics

#### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

Operational control

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

*Locations within Ingersoll Rand's (IR) Environmental Inventory have full authority to introduce and implement operating policies, though many locations are leased.*

### **Biodiversity**

## (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

*Select from:*

Operational control

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

*Locations within Ingersoll Rand's (IR) Environmental Inventory have full authority to introduce and implement operating policies, though many locations are leased.  
[Fixed row]*

## C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:

No

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

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

Select all that apply

Yes, an acquisition

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

*Acquired organizations in prior reporting year: SPX Flow, Paragon Tank, Howden Roots, LRB, A&F D, EcoPlant, Trace Analytics, K.Lund, Anhui Gaopeng, Fraserwoods, Oxywise, Oxkotechnik, PartenAir. Acquired organizations in reporting year (not in reporting year inventory): Fruitland, CAPS, AirSystems, ASPS, APSCO, CAG Technologies, Rotodel, NKS, Toshniwal, Controlled Fluidics, EthaFilter, ILC Dover, Penn Valley Pump, ASF Limited, Hi-Lane Industries, Bluetech, UT Pumps, Fruilair.*

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

*Acquisitions - in 2023 we had 13 acquisitions: SPX Flow (Jan 2023), Paragon Tank (Feb 2023), Howden Roots, Anhui Gaopeng (Aug 2023), LRB, A&F D, EcoPlant (April 2023), Trace Analytics (May 2023), K.Lund (July 2023), Fraserwoods, Oxywise (Oct 2023), Oxkotechnik, PartenAir (Nov 2023). Acquisitions - In 2024 we had 18 acquisitions: Fruitland, CAPS (June 2024), AirSystems, ASPS, APSCO, CAG Technologies, Rotodel, NKS, Toshniwal (Dec 2024), Controlled Fluidics, EthaFilter (Apr 2024), ILC Dover (Jun 2024), Penn Valley Pump (Nov 2024), ASF Limited, Hi-Lane Industries (Jul 2024), Bluetech, UT Pumps (Oct 2024), Fruilair (Feb 2024) [Fixed row]*

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

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

Select all that apply

Yes, a change in boundary

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

*As a result of M&A activities since 2020 (surpassed a 5% impact on Scopes 1 and 2) and a drive for consistent improvement, in 2023, Ingersoll Rand significantly expanded its inventory boundary from financial control to operational control, which greatly increased the number of locations (SVC and ADMIN) reporting all Scopes 1 and 2 metrics. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Subsequently, in 2024, a base year (2020) recalculation was conducted for all environmental metrics in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard Revised Edition, January 2005, World Resources Institute. This recalculation comprised of the inclusion of locations acquired in 2023, the adjustment of data errors and the addition of either actual or benchmark consumption values for the SVC and ADMIN locations. All subsequent years after the base year were calculated in conformance with this method. In 2024, a base year (2020) recalculation was performed for all Scope 3. For Category 11 this recalculation comprised of the inclusion of products from businesses acquired in 2023 and a methodology adjustment to correct for data accuracy. Excluded from this recalculation are products from businesses acquired in 2024. All base year calculations were performed in accordance with the GHG Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, 2013, World Resources Institute. All subsequent years after the base year were calculated in conformance with this method. Ingersoll Rands' Scope 3 emissions data were prepared in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and are based on the best available information we were able to obtain from our systems and include a number of assumptions and extrapolations. We expect to make regular adjustments to our Scope 3 emissions data, procedures, assumptions, and models as we collaborate with external advisors to enhance our methodology and transition from broad measurement approaches (such as spend or average) to more detailed methods which may lead to noteworthy fluctuations in the Scope 3 emissions. Lastly, Ingersoll Rand's inventory has been both 3rd party assured (limited assurance) and validated by SBTi for near-term and net-zero targets.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### (7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

Yes

### (7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

Scope 1

Scope 2, location-based

Scope 2, market-based

Scope 3

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

*Ingersoll Rand's significance threshold for a base year recalculation is a change of +/- 5% impact on any metric (energy, emissions, water, or waste). The threshold can be achieved as a result of material data error discovery, mergers and acquisitions, and business unit divestitures. For instance, inventory boundary expansion of previously non-material sites could have an aggregated impact that is greater than 5% on a metric, which would trigger a base year recalculation. To account for structural changes within the business, all mergers, acquisitions, and divestments will trigger a base year recalculation (per GHG Protocol Revised Edition - "Tracking Emissions Over Time"). This will take place once one calendar years' worth of data has been collected for M&A locations and upon completion of the sale for divested locations. Business activity adjustments, outsourcing/insourcing changes (to the extent that scope 3 for emissions is being reported), and organic growth do not trigger a base year recalculation. Annually in January, a review of all relevant information by facility (data accuracy, acquisitions, divestitures, etc.) is performed to determine inclusion or exclusion from the base year. If data errors are uncovered in the base year or any subsequent year, actuals (invoices) will be requested at the site level. If actuals are not available, estimates will be used. Estimates are derived from a site's previous year's data or the average of the current year's data. If new metrics are deemed to be material to the environmental inventory, they will be collected and added to the baseline year on a case-by-case basis. For instance, water, electricity, and natural gas were collected by SVC locations in 2023 due to their aggregate impact likely being material on the metric (>=5% impact). The locations that reported data in 2023 had that data rebaselined (added to 2020 and subsequent years) in 2024. Those locations that did not report in 2023 were expected to collect that data in 2024. The base year and all subsequent years are recalculated in order to accurately reflect structural changes, errors, or methodology adjustments that have an effect on Ingersoll Rand's 2030 and 2050 sustainability goals. All sustainability data (energy, emissions, water, and waste) follow the same base year recalculation process. The method is applied consistently.*

### (7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

Yes

[Fixed row]

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

*Select all that apply*

- ISO 14064-1
- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

**(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**

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM/CVS. Please see the Assurance Statement on our website (<https://www.irco.com/en-us/company/corporate-responsibility/sustainability-reports>)*

*[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:

Yes

**(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.**

**Row 1**

#### **(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions**

*Friulair*

#### **(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)**

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### **(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source**

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### **(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source**

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### **(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source**

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

02/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 2

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Ethafilter S.R.L*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

04/02/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 3

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Controlled Fluidics LLC*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

04/02/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 4

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Air Systems*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

05/13/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

**Row 5**

### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*ILC Dover*

### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.

### Row 6

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Del Pump*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

06/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 7

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*CAPS Australia*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

06/03/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 8

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Fruitland*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

Scope 1

Scope 2 (location-based)

Scope 2 (market-based)

Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

06/03/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 9

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Advanced Filtration Systems*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

07/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

**Row 10**

### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Hi-Line Industries Limited*

### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

## Row 11

### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Blutex*

### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

10/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 12

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Air Power Systems*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

10/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 13

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*UT Pumps*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

10/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 14

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Penn Valley Pumps*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

11/01/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

**Row 15**

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Toshniwal Instruments Madras Private Limited (TIMPL)*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

*Select from:*

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.

### Row 16

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

CAG Technologies Inc.

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

12/02/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 17

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Air Systems and Pump Solutions*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

- Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

12/02/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

### Row 18

#### (7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

*Rotodel*

#### (7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)
- Scope 3: Use of sold products

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition or merger

#### (7.4.1.7) Date of completion of acquisition or merger

12/02/2024

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*Excluded from the reporting year inventory and base year recalculations are the locations from businesses acquired in 2024.*

[Add row]

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

#### Scope 1

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

46214

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024).*

## Scope 2 (location-based)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

67253

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, etc.) they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors: - U.S. EPA (eGrid 2020 - published February 2022) - IEA (published September 2023)*

## Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

73508

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Locations purchasing bundled retail renewable electricity (bundled EACs) have a zero emission factor applied to the volume of electricity corresponding to the certificates. Emission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, Green\_E, AIB, etc.) they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors: - Green\_E Residual Mix (Green\_E - published October 2022) - AIB European Residual Mix (AIB - published September 2023) - IEA (published September 2023)*

## Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

575624

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

23098

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

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

## (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

21868

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average-data measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: Fuel: DEFRA/DBEIS WTT (2020/2022) Electricity: AR5 GWP (CH4 & N2O conversion to CO2e) & IEA WTT/T&D Losses (2020)*

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

## (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

93491

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

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

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

3630

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average-data measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's Scope 3 Category 5*

### Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

630

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The fuel-based (air and rail) and spend-based (rental car) measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: - Air and Rail: U.S. EPA Emission Factors*

for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024) and DEFRA/DBEIS WTT (2020/2022) - Rental car: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.

### Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

25147

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Differing assumptions based on employee commutes for Americas, AP, and EMEIA. The average-data measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024).

### Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

### Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

12359

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Ingersoll Rand's spend on on upstream transportation and distribution (Cat 4) used as estimate for downstream transportation and distribution (Cat 9). Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

11

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average and spend based measurement approaches were utilized for this category. Internal estimates were used to create a model of energy needed to process sold products (metal castings). Emission factors: U.S. EPA (eGrid 2020 - published February 2022) and EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The ISO LCA 14040 measurement approach was utilized for this category. Representative models for product groupings were utilized. Our use of sold products (Category 11) model in SimaPro covers the GHG emissions from 80%+ of our total complete units revenue. The GHG emissions from the remaining portion of our complete units revenue was extrapolated from the model and as such our total calculated complete revenue may not match actual total complete revenue. Emission factors: IEA and Ecolnvent grid mixes based on units sales. Additionally, IEA scenario-based electricity emission factor values (World Energy Outlook Dataset) based on Stated Policies (STEPS) were applied to all years after the reporting year to 2050.*

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

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

33439

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average-data based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024).*

### Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

2524

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

### Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

### Scope 3 category 15: Investments

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

34983

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

### Scope 3: Other (upstream)

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

0.0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

### Scope 3: Other (downstream)

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

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

0.0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

[Fixed row]

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

#### Reporting year

#### (7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

### (7.6.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories.*

## Past year 1

### (7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42056

### (7.6.2) End date

12/31/2023

### (7.6.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories.*

## Past year 2

### (7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41681

### (7.6.2) End date

12/31/2022

### (7.6.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories.*

#### Past year 3

### (7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

45008

### (7.6.2) End date

12/31/2021

### (7.6.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories.*

#### Past year 4

### (7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

46214

### (7.6.2) End date

12/31/2020

### (7.6.3) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### Reporting year

#### (7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57694

#### (7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50061

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Locations purchasing bundled retail renewable electricity (bundled EACs) have a a emission factor applied to the volume of electricity corresponding to the certificates. \n\nEmission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, Green\_E, AIB, etc.), they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors (market): Green\_E Residual Mix (Green\_E - published October 2023)\n- AIB European Residual Mix (AIB - published September 2023)- IEA (published September 2023) Emission factors (location): U.S. EPA (eGrid 2022 - published January 2024) IEA (published September 2023)*

### Past year 1

#### (7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

58523

## (7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54579

### (7.7.3) End date

12/31/2023

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Locations purchasing bundled retail renewable electricity (bundled EACs) have a a emission factor applied to the volume of electricity corresponding to the certificates. \n\nEmission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, Green\_E, AIB, etc.), they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors (market): Green\_E Residual Mix (Green\_E - published October 2023)\n- AIB European Residual Mix (AIB - published September 2023)- IEA (published September 2023) Emission factors (location): U.S. EPA (eGrid 2022 - published January 2024) IEA (published September 2023)*

## Past year 2

## (7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

64582

## (7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

59888

### (7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Locations purchasing bundled retail renewable electricity (bundled EACs) have a zero emission factor applied to the volume of electricity corresponding to the certificates. Emission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, Green\_E, AIB, etc.) they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors (market):- Green\_E Residual Mix (Green\_E - published October 2023) AIB European Residual Mix (AIB - published September 2023)\n- IEA (published September 2023) Emission factors (location): U.S. EPA (eGrid 2022 - published January 2024)- IEA (published September 2023)

## Past year 3

### (7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

70236

### (7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

67544

### (7.7.3) End date

12/31/2021

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Locations purchasing bundled retail renewable electricity (bundled EACs) have a zero emission factor applied to the volume of electricity corresponding to the certificates. \n\nEmission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, Green\_E, AIB, etc.) they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors (market): Green\_E Residual Mix (Green\_E - published October 2023) AIB European Residual Mix (AIB - published September 2023) IEA (published September 2023) Emission factors (location): U.S. EPA (eGrid 2021 - published February 2023)- IEA (published September 2023)

## Past year 4

### (7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

67253

### (7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

73508

### (7.7.3) End date

12/31/2020

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 2 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance and Corporate Standard. Non-renewable electricity purchased and district heating purchased. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft). Locations purchasing bundled retail renewable electricity (bundled EACs) have a zero emission factor applied to the volume of electricity corresponding to the certificates. Emission factors are updated consistently. When new emission factors are released by their respective authority (EPA, IEA, Green\_E, AIB, etc.) they will be implemented in the most recent year in which the data was collected to calculate the factors. Additionally, all subsequent years will have the new emission factors applied so an accurate and consistent comparison can be made. Emission factors (market):\n- Green\_E Residual Mix (Green\_E - published October 2022)\n- AIB European Residual Mix (AIB - published September 2023)\n- IEA (published September 2023) Emission factors (location) U.S. EPA (eGrid 2020 - published February 2022)- IEA (published September 2023)*

*[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)

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

**(7.8.5) Please explain**

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

**Capital goods****(7.8.1) Evaluation status**

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

26460

**(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology**

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

### 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)

18918

#### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

100

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average-data measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: Fuel: DEFRA/DBEIS WTT (2020/2022) Electricity: AR5 GWP (CH4 & N2O conversion to CO2e) & IEA WTT/T&D Losses (2020)*

### Upstream transportation and distribution

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

69074

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Waste generated in operations

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

5748

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

#### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average-data measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's Scope 3 Category 5*

### Business travel

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

12897

#### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Fuel-based method

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

100

#### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The fuel-based (air and rail) and spend-based (rental car) measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: - Air and Rail: U.S. EPA Emission Factors*

for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024) and DEFRA/DBEIS WTT (2020/2022) - Rental car: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.

## Employee commuting

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

28717

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Differing assumptions based on employee commutes for Americas, AP, and EMEIA. The average-data measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024).*

## Upstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand does not have any upstream leased assets that are not incorporated into Scope 1 & 2.*

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

9132

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Ingersoll Rand's spend on on upstream transportation and distribution (Cat 4) used as estimate for downstream transportation and distribution (Cat 9). Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Processing of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

16

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average and spend based measurement approaches were utilized for this category. Internal estimates were used to create a model of energy needed to process sold products (metal castings). Emission factors: U.S. EPA (eGrid 2020 - published February 2022) and EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Use of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

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

191580579

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Other, please specify :ISO LCA 14040

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

0

#### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The ISO LCA 14040 measurement approach was utilized for this category. Representative models for product groupings were utilized. Our use of sold products (Category 11) model in SimaPro covers the GHG emissions from 80%+ of our total complete units revenue. The GHG emissions from the remaining portion of our complete units revenue was extrapolated from the model and as such our total calculated completes revenue may not match actual total completes revenue. Engineering inputs (electricity consumption, etc.) are derived directly from engineering teams who test each machine for these inputs. Emission factors: IEA and Ecolnvent grid mixes based on units sales. Additionally, IEA scenario-based electricity emission factor values (World Energy Outlook Dataset) based on Stated Policies (STEPS) were applied to all years after the reporting year to 2050.*

### End of life treatment of sold products

#### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

48934

#### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The average-data based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (published Feb 12, 2024).*

## Downstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

7196

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Franchises

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand does not have any franchises.*

## Investments

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, calculated

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

36225

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Spend-based method

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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 3 emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. The spend based measurement approach was utilized for this category. Emission factors: EPA's USEEIO supply chain GHG emission factors (MT CO2e/2021 USD) with margins.*

## Other (upstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

N/A

### Other (downstream)

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

N/A

[Fixed row]

### (7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

### Past year 1

#### (7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2023

#### (7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

856317

#### (7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

34660

**(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

18810

**(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

57471

**(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

4463

**(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)**

13079

**(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)**

27946

**(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

7598

**(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

18

**(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

**(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

53357

**(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

6752

**(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)**

34965

**(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.19) Comment**

*In 2024, a base year (2020) recalculation was performed for all Scope 3. For Category 11 this recalculation comprised of the inclusion of products from businesses acquired in 2021 and 2022 and a methodology adjustment to correct for data accuracy. Excluded from this recalculation are products from businesses acquired in 2024. All base year calculations were performed in accordance with the GHG Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, 2013, World Resources Institute. All subsequent years after the base year were calculated in conformance with this method. Ingersoll Rands' Scope 3 emissions data were prepared in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and are based on the best available information we were able to obtain from our systems and include a number of assumptions and extrapolations. We expect to make regular adjustments to our Scope 3 emissions data, procedures, assumptions, and models as we collaborate with external advisors to enhance our methodology and transition from broad measurement approaches (such as spend or average) to more detailed methods which may lead to noteworthy fluctuations in the Scope 3 emissions.*

## Past year 2

### (7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

### (7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

824740

### (7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

28697

### (7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

21389

### (7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

90249

### (7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

4480

### (7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

9004

### (7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

25522

### (7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

11931

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

16

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

213521436

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

45110

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

4184

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

39162

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

**(7.8.1.19) Comment**

*In 2024, a base year (2020) recalculation was performed for all Scope 3. For Category 11 this recalculation comprised of the inclusion of products from businesses acquired in 2021 and 2022 and a methodology adjustment to correct for data accuracy. Excluded from this recalculation are products from businesses acquired in 2024. All base year calculations were performed in accordance with the GHG Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, 2013, World Resources Institute. All subsequent years after the base year were calculated in conformance with this method. Ingersoll Rands' Scope 3 emissions data were prepared in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and are based on the best available information we were able to obtain from our systems and include a number of assumptions and extrapolations. We expect to make regular adjustments to our Scope 3 emissions data, procedures, assumptions, and models as we collaborate with external advisors to enhance our methodology and transition from broad measurement approaches (such as spend or average) to more detailed methods which may lead to noteworthy fluctuations in the Scope 3 emissions.*

**Past year 3****(7.8.1.1) End date**

12/31/2021

**(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)**

716531

**(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)**

25655

**(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

22013

**(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

65719

**(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

4912

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

5013

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

23721

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

8688

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

15

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

201563734

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

39236

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

3446

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

34981

#### (7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.8.1.19) Comment

*In 2024, a base year (2020) recalculation was performed for all Scope 3. For Category 11 this recalculation comprised of the inclusion of products from businesses acquired in 2021 and 2022 and a methodology adjustment to correct for data accuracy. Excluded from this recalculation are products from businesses acquired in 2024. All base year calculations were performed in accordance with the GHG Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, 2013, World Resources Institute. All subsequent years after the base year were calculated in conformance with this method. Ingersoll Rands' Scope 3 emissions data were prepared in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and are based on the best available information we were able to obtain from our systems and include a number of assumptions and extrapolations. We expect to make regular adjustments to our Scope 3 emissions data, procedures, assumptions, and models as we collaborate with external advisors to enhance our methodology and transition from broad measurement approaches (such as spend or average) to more detailed methods which may lead to noteworthy fluctuations in the Scope 3 emissions.*

### Past year 4

#### (7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2020

#### (7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

575624

#### (7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

23099

**(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)**

21868

**(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

93491

**(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)**

3630

**(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)**

630

**(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)**

25147

**(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)**

12359

**(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

11

**(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

**(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)**

33439

**(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)**

2524

**(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)**

34983

**(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.8.1.19) Comment**

*In 2024, a base year (2020) recalculation was performed for all Scope 3. For Category 11 this recalculation comprised of the inclusion of products from businesses acquired in 2021 and 2022 and a methodology adjustment to correct for data accuracy. Excluded from this recalculation are products from businesses acquired in 2024. All base year calculations were performed in accordance with the GHG Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, 2013, World Resources Institute. All subsequent years after the base year were calculated in conformance with this method. Ingersoll Rands' Scope 3 emissions data were prepared in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and are based on the best available information we were able to obtain from our systems and include a number of assumptions and extrapolations. We expect to make regular adjustments to our Scope 3 emissions data, procedures, assumptions, and models as we collaborate with external advisors to enhance our methodology and transition from broad measurement approaches (such as spend or average) to more detailed methods which may lead to noteworthy fluctuations in the Scope 3 emissions.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

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

**Row 1**

**(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place**

*Select from:*

Annual process

**(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year**

*Select from:*

Complete

### (7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

*2024 Environmental, Safety, and Product Use Phase Assurance Statement.pdf*

### (7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

1-3

### (7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

### (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:

Complete

### (7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

*2024 Environmental, Safety, and Product Use Phase Assurance Statement.pdf*

### (7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

*All*

### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

### (7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

*100*

## 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:

Complete

### (7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

*2024 Environmental, Safety, and Product Use Phase Assurance Statement.pdf*

### (7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

*All*

### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

### (7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

*100*

*[Add row]*

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

**Row 1**

**(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category**

*Select all that apply*

Scope 3: Business travel

**(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place**

*Select from:*

Annual process

**(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year**

*Select from:*

Complete

**(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance**

*Select from:*

Limited assurance

**(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement**

*2024 Environmental, Safety, and Product Use Phase Assurance Statement.pdf*

**(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference**

*All*

**(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard**

Select from:

ISAE3000

### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

## Row 2

### (7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

Scope 3: Employee commuting

### (7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

### (7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

### (7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

2024 Environmental, Safety, and Product Use Phase Assurance Statement.pdf

### (7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

### (7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

### (7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

## Row 3

### (7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

Scope 3: Use of sold products

### (7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

### (7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

### (7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

### (7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

**(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference**

All

**(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard**

Select from:

ISAE3000

**(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

100

[Add row]

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

Select from:

Decreased

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

**Change in renewable energy consumption**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

3304

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.4

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*All locations consuming renewable electricity have been reviewed for appropriate ownership of environmental attribute certificates and all environmental benefit associated with the electricity. In total, the purchasing of retail renewable electricity at our manufacturing facilities accounted for a reduction of 8,558 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e and our solar rooftop power purchase agreements and owned solar projects at our manufacturing facilities accounted for a reduction of 6,276 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. This is a reduction of 3,304 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e vs. 2023.*

## Other emissions reduction activities

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

2706

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.8

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2024 Ingersoll Rands' main emitter of refrigerants adjusted to a lower GWP refrigerant for its product testing process. The switch accounted for a YOY reduction of 2,706 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.*

## Divestment

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

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**

N/A

**Acquisitions**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

Select from:

No change

**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

0

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

N/A

**Mergers**

**(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions**

Select from:

No change

**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

0

**(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation**

N/A

**Change in output**

**(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**

N/A

## Change in methodology

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

## Change in boundary

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

## Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

## Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

#### Other

#### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1632

#### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

#### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.7

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Ingersoll Rand has a Green Excellence program (a behavior based multi-pillar approach to operational efficiencies led by site level technical experts) has been implemented at over 50% of our manufacturing facilities. This program focuses on the reduction of electricity and fuel consumption at the facility and has lead to an overall energy consumption reduction accounting for a 1.7% emissions reduction.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

Select from:

Market-based

#### (7.11) How do your total Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:

Decreased

(7.11.1) For each Scope 3 category calculated in 7.8, specify how your emissions compare to the previous year and identify the reason for any change.

## Purchased goods and services

### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

106959

### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

12

### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Less spend.*

## Capital goods

### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

8200

### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

24

### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Less spend on capital goods.*

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

### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Increased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

109

### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

**(7.11.1.5) Please explain**

*Increased fuel consumption.*

**Upstream transportation and distribution****(7.11.1.1) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

Increased

**(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change**

*Select from:*

Change in output

**(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)**

11603

**(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category**

20

**(7.11.1.5) Please explain**

*Increased spend.*

**Waste generated in operations****(7.11.1.1) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

Increased

#### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

#### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

1285

#### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

29

#### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Increased total waste.*

### **Business travel**

#### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

#### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

#### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

183

**(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category**

1

**(7.11.1.5) Please explain**

*Less business travel.*

**Employee commuting**

**(7.11.1.1) Direction of change**

*Select from:*

Increased

**(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change**

*Select from:*

Change in output

**(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)**

771

**(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category**

1

**(7.11.1.5) Please explain**

*More employees.*

**Downstream transportation and distribution**

**(7.11.1.1) Direction of change**

Select from:

Increased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

1534

### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

20

### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Increased spend.*

## Processing of sold products

### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

2

#### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

10

#### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Decreased output.*

#### Use of sold products

#### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

#### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Other, please specify :Sales of higher energy consuming machines in markets with higher grid emission factors decreased year over year. Additionally, IR continues to develop and release more energy efficient products.

#### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

19995793

#### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

9

#### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Sales of higher energy consuming machines in markets with higher grid emissions decreased year over year. Additionally, IR continues to develop and release more energy efficient products.*

#### End-of-life treatment of sold products

### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

4422

### (7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

7

### (7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Less material inputs due to less output. More recyclable materials.*

## Downstream leased assets

### (7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

Increased

### (7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

Change in output

### (7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

**(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category**

6

**(7.11.1.5) Please explain***Higher revenue from rentals.***Investments****(7.11.1.1) Direction of change***Select from:* Increased**(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change***Select from:* Change in output**(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)**

1260

**(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category**

4

**(7.11.1.5) Please explain***Higher investment stake in already partially owned businesses.**[Fixed row]*

**(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)**

36239.94

**(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:

HFCs

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

2692.34

### (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.**

## Australia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

494.13

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

188.15

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

176.25

## Austria

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

99.75

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

3.51

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

3.33

**Belgium**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

169.02

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

22.32

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

27.43

**Brazil**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

412.31

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

228.59

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

126.9

## Canada

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

242.06

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

148.35

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

138.06

## Chile

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

284.99

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

23.57

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

20.38

## China

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2016.33

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

13400.37

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

12949.9

## **Colombia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

43.88

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

1.21

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

1.18

## **Czechia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

207.75

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

208

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

325.52

## **Finland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

8.92

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

330.496

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

47.6

**France**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2092.71

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

285.678

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

116.92

**Germany**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2766.44

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

3088.238

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

637.81

**India**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

999.48

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

4902.888

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

4270.86

**Indonesia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2.12

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

1.13

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

1.14

**Ireland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

14.76

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

17.38

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

24.43

## Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1609.84

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

1405.431

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

0

## Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.35

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

39.3

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

39.35

## Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

163.52

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

101.2

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

102.92

## Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

547.56

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

85.92

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

77.6

## Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

260.2

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

98.66

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

119.94

**New Zealand**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

19.8

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

2.42

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

1.7

**Philippines**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

10.06

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

19.44

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

19.1

## Poland

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

567.14

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

123.762

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

96.07

## Republic of Korea

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

89.01

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

46.1

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

43.55

## Singapore

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

78.11

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

184.313

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

42.73

## **Slovenia**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2650.27

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

38.61

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

83.01

## **South Africa**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

650.47

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

589.6

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

649.38

## **Spain**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

351.57

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

91.96

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

172.47

**Sweden**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

59.92

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

0.061

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

0.2

**Switzerland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

88.92

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

0.36

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

0

**Taiwan, China**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

171

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

113.84

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

110.51

**United Arab Emirates**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

16.84

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

55.9

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

35.43

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1696.53

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

833.08

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

1297.09

## **United States of America**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

20007.06

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

31007.77

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

28297.93

## **Viet Nam**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

31.73

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

4.71

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

4.25

[Fixed row]

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

*Select all that apply*

By business division

**(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.**

**Row 1**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*Enterprise Services*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

1468.37

**Row 2**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AMERICAS-Compression Systems and Services*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

15419.6

**Row 3**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AMERICAS-Latin America*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

1278.94

**Row 4**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AMERICAS-Process Flow Technologies*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

1929.77

**Row 5**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AP*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

3001.16

**Row 6**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-EMEIA-Compression Systems and Services*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

9067.48

**Row 7**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-EMEIA-Process Flow Technologies*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

3080.21

**Row 8**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*Life Science Technologies*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

746.1

**Row 9**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*Power Tools and Lifting*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

462.08

**Row 10**

**(7.17.1.1) Business division**

*Precision Technologies*

**(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)**

2478.55  
[Add row]

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

*Select all that apply*

By business division

**(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.**

**Row 1**

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*Enterprise Services*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

300.81

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

423.8

**Row 2**

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AMERICAS-Compression Systems and Services*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

9052.34

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

6981.47

### Row 3

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AMERICAS-Latin America*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

339.28

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

226.05

### Row 4

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AMERICAS-Process Flow Technologies*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

10137.12

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

9938.83

### Row 5

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-AP*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

10534.22

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

10044.3

**Row 6**

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-EMEIA-Compression Systems and Services*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

4514.79

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

3056.81

**Row 7**

**(7.20.1.1) Business division**

*ITS-EMEIA-Process Flow Technologies*

**(7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

4413.38

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

3216.77

## Row 8

### (7.20.1.1) Business division

*Life Science Technologies*

### (7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

9082.79

### (7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8609.76

## Row 9

### (7.20.1.1) Business division

*Power Tools and Lifting*

### (7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3472.52

### (7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3385.48

## Row 10

### (7.20.1.1) Business division

*Precision Technologies*

### (7.20.1.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

5846.97

**(7.20.1.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

4177.73

[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)**

38932

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

57694

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

50061

**(7.22.4) Please explain**

*All Ingersoll Rand operationally controlled locations are included in these values. Any other locations would be joint ventures or equity stakes which we account for in our Scope 3 inventory.*

**All other entities**

**(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

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

0

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

0

### (7.22.4) Please explain

N/A

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

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

Row 1

### (7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

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

*With a wide variety of product lines, each with different manufacturing processes, energy usage, and supply chains, it becomes difficult to accurately track the emissions generated by each product. This diversity complicates allocating emissions to specific customers. As a possible solution, engaging customers in emissions tracking and reporting can help tailor the allocation based on specific product use, rather than estimates. Collaborative platforms that share data between*

manufacturers and customers could provide more accurate insights. Using data analytics tools and IoT sensors in the production process can track energy consumption, resource use, and emissions in real time. These systems can automatically allocate emissions based on actual data from each product line.  
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

Yes

**(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities**

*As customer interest grows in allocated emissions for the measurement of their Scope 3 categories, Ingersoll Rand will implement where appropriate further measurement activities.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from:

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

**Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

Select from:

HHV (higher heating value)

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

0

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

167905

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

167905.00

## Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

35641

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

107924

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

143565.00

## 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**

3882

**(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh**

3882.00

**Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

5009

**(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh**

5009.00

**Total energy consumption**

**(7.30.1.1) Heating value**

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

**(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources**

40650

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

276572

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

317222.00

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

## Sustainable biomass

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

## 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

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

## Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

**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

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

**Oil**

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

82836.26

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions (and associated fuels) in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft).*

### Gas

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

85069.17

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions (and associated fuels) in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft).*

### 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

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

### Total fuel

### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

167905.43

### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Ingersoll Rand reports Scope 1 emissions (and associated fuels) in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. Data was assured by ERM. Metrics included are gasoline and diesel (stationary and mobile), natural gas, propane, and refrigerants (fugitive emissions from releases). Assumption that 98% of fuels are from mobile combustion. Extrapolated data used for SVC and ADMIN locations. As most of these locations are leased, extrapolations were used for all locations based on data (electricity and natural gas consumption) from the locations that could obtain utility invoices. Extrapolations are on an intensity ratio (Mcf / sq ft, kWh / sq ft).*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### Electricity

### (7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

8148

**(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

5009

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

8148

**(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

5009

## **Heat**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

0

## **Steam**

**(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

**Cooling**

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

*[Fixed row]*

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

Row 1

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

- United States of America

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

- Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

- Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

- Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar and wind mix

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

7753.66

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- US-REC

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

Select from:

- United States of America

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

Select from:

No

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled RECs

### Row 2

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Germany

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar and wind mix

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

7525.02

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

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

Select from:

Germany

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

Select from:

No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled GOs

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Solar

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

6770.72

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Contract

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

Select from:

China

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

Select from:

Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

*PPA - rooftop solar owned by third party*

**Row 4**

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Finland

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

4632.49

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

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

Select from:

Finland

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

Select from:

No

## (7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled GOs

### Row 5

## (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Italy

## (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

## (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

## (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

4493.07

## (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

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

Select from:

Italy

**(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)**

2011

**(7.30.14.10) Comment**

Bundled GOs

**Row 6**

**(7.30.14.1) Country/area**

Select from:

France

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar and wind mix

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

2119.85

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

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

Select from:

France

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

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled GOs

#### Row 7

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

India

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

- Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

- Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

- Solar

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

1006

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- Contract

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

Select from:

- India

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

Select from:

- Yes

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

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

*Wheel agreement PPA for solar.*

### Row 8

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

*Select from:*

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

*Select from:*

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

*Select from:*

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

*Select from:*

Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar and wind mix

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

732.77

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

*Select from:*

REGO

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

Select from:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled REGOs

### Row 9

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Singapore

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Solar

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

371.4

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

I-REC

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

Select from:

Singapore

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

Select from:

No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

*Bundled I-REC*

**Row 10**

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Solar

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

165.26

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

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

Select from:

Spain

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

Select from:

Yes

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

2022

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

*PPA - rooftop solar owned by third party*

### Row 11

### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

*Select from:*

Poland

### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

*Select from:*

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

*Select from:*

Electricity

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

*Select from:*

Solar

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

70.19

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

*Select from:*

GO

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

Select from:

Poland

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

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled GOs

### Row 12

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Sweden

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Solar

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

2.41

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

GO

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

Select from:

Sweden

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

Select from:

No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

Bundled GOs

Row 14

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Germany

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Heat/steam/cooling supply agreement

### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Heat

### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :Zero emission factor (per utility certificate) waste heat from electricity generation.

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

1688.02

### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Contract

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

Select from:

Germany

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

Select from:

No

### (7.30.14.10) Comment

Waste heat purchase  
[Add row]

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

**Australia**

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

288.84

(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)

288.84

**Austria**

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26.39

(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)

26.39

## Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

163.79

(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)

163.79

## Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1703.34

(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)

1703.34

## Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1253.99

(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)

1253.99

**Chile**

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

62.98

(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)

62.98

**China**

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

28638.16

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

289.2

(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)

28927.36

## Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7.91

(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)

7.91

## Czechia

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

494.28

**(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)**

494.28

**Finland**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

4716.69

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

0

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

1204.18

**(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)

5920.87

## France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4989.5

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

132.53

(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)

5122.03

## Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8360.13

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

1653.2

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

2677.37

(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)

12690.70

## India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6815.9

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

1265.68

(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)

8081.58

## Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1.44

(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)

1.44

## Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54.86

(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)**

54.86

**Italy**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

4493.07

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

1668.41

**(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)**

6161.48

**Japan**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

84.51

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

84.51

## Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

163.09

(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)

163.09

## Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

210.7

(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)

210.70

## Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

315.71

(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)

315.71

## New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17.9

(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)

17.90

## Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

27.35

(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)

27.35

**Poland**

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

192.08

(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)**

192.08

**Republic of Korea**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

100.77

**(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)**

100.77

**Singapore**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

483.76

**(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)

483.76

## Slovenia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

170.54

(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)

170.54

## South Africa

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

654.82

**(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)**

654.82

**Spain**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

775.87

**(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)

775.87

## Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5.33

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

5.33

## Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13.8

(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)

13.80

### Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

199.33

(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)

199.33

## United Arab Emirates

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

84.51

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

84.51

## United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4072.3

### (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)**

4072.30

**United States of America**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

73919.29

**(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)**

73919.29

**Viet Nam**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

8.33

**(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)**

8.33

[Fixed row]

**(7.34) Does your organization measure the efficiency of any of its products or services?**

**(7.34.1) Measurement of product/service efficiency**

Select from:

Yes

**(7.34.2) Comment**

*Ingersoll Rand integrates its comprehensive Design for Sustainability (DfS) program into all new product development initiatives. Each business unit receives specific energy efficiency targets for its product portfolio, ensuring that sustainability is a core consideration throughout the design process.*

[Fixed row]

**(7.34.1) Provide details of the metrics used to measure the efficiency of your organization's products or services.**

## Row 1

### (7.34.1.1) Category of product or service

Select from:

Industrial machinery

### (7.34.1.2) Product or service (optional)

*Approximately 51% of Ingersoll Rand's revenue came from the sale of products that have an efficiency benefit vs. the prior model or similar products available on the market. The product lines are very diverse and as such, have varying efficiency measures. Our products contribute to a range of positive impacts, including decreased energy and water consumption, reduced waste generation, and lower greenhouse gas emissions.*

### (7.34.1.3) % of revenue from this product or service in the reporting year

51

### (7.34.1.4) Efficiency figure in the reporting year

0.115395

### (7.34.1.5) Metric numerator

Select from:

tCO2e

### (7.34.1.6) Metric denominator

Select from:

USD (\$) value-added

### (7.34.1.7) Comment

*Approximately 51% of Ingersoll Rand's revenue came from the sale of products that have an efficiency benefit vs. the prior model or similar products available on the market. The product lines are very diverse and as such, have varying efficiency measures. Our products contribute to a range of positive impacts, including decreased energy and water consumption, reduced waste generation, and lower greenhouse gas emissions. All new product development at Ingersoll Rand includes*

design for sustainability. Products under development or products being reconfigured are required to perform a quantitative comparative analysis to determine efficiency. The efficiency value is part of Ingersoll Rand's near/long term goals to reduce its scope 3 GHG emissions from use of sold products 97% per USD value added.

[Add 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**

0.0000123

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

88993.24

**(7.45.3) Metric denominator**

Select from:

unit total revenue

**(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total**

7240000000

**(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used**

Select from:

Market-based

**(7.45.6) % change from previous year**

13.5

### (7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

Change in renewable energy consumption

Change in output

Change in revenue

### (7.45.9) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand increased revenues from both products and services in 2024 vs. 2023. Scope 1 and 2 emissions decreased during the same period due to renewable energy purchases and energy efficiency projects*

## Row 2

### (7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.002189

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

88993.24

### (7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

unit hour worked

### (7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

40654709

### (7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

- Market-based

### (7.45.6) % change from previous year

18.67

### (7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

- Decreased

### (7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

- Change in renewable energy consumption
- Other emissions reduction activities
- Change in output

### (7.45.9) Please explain

*Scope 1 and 2 emissions decreased during the same period due to renewable energy purchases and energy efficiency projects*  
[Add row]

## (7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

### Row 1

#### (7.52.1) Description

Select from:

- Energy usage

### (7.52.2) Metric value

0.04

### (7.52.3) Metric numerator

317,222,150

### (7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

\$7,240,000,000

### (7.52.5) % change from previous year

7.3

### (7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

Decreased

### (7.52.7) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand increased revenues from both products and services in 2024 vs. 2023. Scope 1 and 2 emissions decreased during the same period due to renewable energy purchases and energy efficiency projects*

[Add row]

### (7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

Absolute target

Intensity target

### (7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

## Row 1

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 1

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

20241204\_Ingersoll Rand Inc\_Near-Term Approval Letter.pdf

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2021

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

Carbon dioxide (CO2)

Methane (CH4)

- Nitrous oxide (N2O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

### (7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

- Market-based

### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2020

### (7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

46214

### (7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

73508

### (7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

### (7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

119722.000

### (7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

**(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

100

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

100

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

12/31/2030

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

42

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

69438.760

**(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

38932

**(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

50061

**(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

88993.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

#### (7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

61.11

#### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Revised

#### (7.53.1.81) Explain the reasons for the revision, replacement, or retirement of the target

*Directly align and confirm to SBTi target setting.*

#### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Includes total direct GHG emissions (Scope 1) and indirect GHG from energy purchased and consumed (Scope 2) from all operationally controlled facilities.*

#### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*Reducing Scope 1 and 2 emissions is directly linked to Ingersoll Rand's strategic imperative of sustainable growth.*

#### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*Ingersoll Rand has a multi-year road map with several large projects for achieving our set targets. Our Green Excellence program (a behavior based multi-pillar approach to operational efficiencies led by site level technical experts) has been implemented at over 50% of our manufacturing facilities. We have added and expect to continue adding additional retail renewable electricity contracts and site level solar projects at our manufacturing facilities. The phasing out of high GWP refrigerants in our product testing has continued with an expected project completion date of early 2025. Our fleet has increased the number of hybrid and electric vehicles year-over-year and expect to electrify nearly 50% of our fleet by 2030.*

#### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

## Row 2

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 2

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

[20241204\\_Ingersoll Rand Inc\\_Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf](#)

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2021

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)

- Nitrous oxide (N2O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

### (7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

### (7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

- Market-based

### (7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2020

### (7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

46214

### (7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

73508

### (7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

### (7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

119722.000

### (7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

**(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

100

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

100

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

12/31/2050

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

90

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

11972.200

**(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

38932

**(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

50061

**(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

88993.000

**(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target**

Select from:

No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

#### (7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

28.52

#### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Revised

#### (7.53.1.81) Explain the reasons for the revision, replacement, or retirement of the target

*Directly align and confirm to SBTi target setting.*

#### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Includes total direct GHG emissions (Scope 1) and indirect GHG from energy purchased and consumed (Scope 2) from all operationally controlled facilities.*

#### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*Reducing Scope 1 and 2 emissions is directly linked to Ingersoll Rand's strategic imperative of sustainable growth.*

#### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*Ingersoll Rand has a multi-year road map with several large projects for achieving our set targets. Our Green Excellence program (a behavior based multi-pillar approach to operational efficiencies led by site level technical experts) has been implemented at over 50% of our manufacturing facilities. We have added and expect to continue adding additional retail renewable electricity contracts and site level solar projects at our manufacturing facilities. The phasing out of high GWP refrigerants in our product testing has continued with an expected project completion date of early 2025. Our fleet has increased the number of hybrid and electric vehicles year-over-year and expect to electrify nearly 50% of our fleet by 2030. VPPAs in either the U.S., E.U., or China and India are being reviewed.*

#### (7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

[Add row]

**(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, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

**(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

*20241204\_Ingersoll Rand Inc\_Near-Term Approval Letter.pdf*

**(7.53.2.4) Target ambition**

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

**(7.53.2.5) Date target was set**

*07/30/2024*

**(7.53.2.6) Target coverage**

Select from:

Organization-wide

### (7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

### (7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 3

### (7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

- Category 11: Use of sold products

### (7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

- Metric tons CO2e per USD(\$) value-added

### (7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2020

### (7.53.2.25) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products

0.163643

### (7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3

0.1636430000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

0.1636430000

(7.53.2.46) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products covered by this Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products intensity figure

91

(7.53.2.53) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this total Scope 3 intensity figure

91

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

91

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2034

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

64

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes

0.0589114800

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-7

(7.53.2.72) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products

0.115395

**(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3**

0.1153950000

**(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes**

0.1153950000

**(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**

46.07

**(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

New

**(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Target coverage includes 91% of emissions from category 11 with no exclusions.*

**(7.53.2.86) Target objective**

*Reducing overall emissions is directly linked to Ingersoll Rand's strategic imperative of sustainable growth.*

**(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*Almost all of Ingersoll Rands' Scope 3 emissions are in category 11 (use of sold products). As it is the major driver to achieve our net zero goal, Ingersoll Rand has implemented a Design for Sustainability program as a systematic methodology during the design of products to better monitor and reduce the environmental impacts.*

Comparative simplified Life Cycle Assessment is the tool utilized to measure alternative designs of our products during multiple gate phases. With all new product designs or product redesigns implementing the design for sustainability initiative, Ingersoll Rand is well underway towards achieving our use-phase emission reduction target. Additionally, Ingersoll Rand is working with external advisors to determine all possible reduction pathways available for our use of sold products. Lastly, Ingersoll Rand is implementing these product efficiencies while also expanding revenues.

### (7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

[Add row]

### (7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

Net-zero targets

### (7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

#### Row 1

#### (7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Low 1

#### (7.54.1.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

#### (7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

#### (7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

All energy carriers

#### (7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

Consumption

#### (7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

Renewable energy source(s) only

#### (7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

#### (7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

1455.2

#### (7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

0.43

#### (7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2050

#### (7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

**(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year**

12.81

**(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year**

12.43

**(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?**

Yes - Abs 1 and 2 / NZ1

**(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?**

Select all that apply

Science Based Targets initiative

**(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

20241204\_Ingersoll Rand Inc\_Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

**(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Ingersoll Rand has a goal of utilizing 100% renewable energy for all operations by 2050.*

**(7.54.1.20) Target objective**

*Ingersoll Rand has a goal of utilizing 100% renewable energy for all operationally controlled locations by 2050. There are no exclusions to this goal.*

**(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

Ingersoll Rand has added and expects to continue adding additional retail renewable electricity contracts and site level solar projects at our manufacturing facilities. Our fleet has increased the number of hybrid and electric vehicles year-over-year and expect to electrify 50% of our fleet by 2030. VPPAs in either the U.S., E.U., or China and India are being reviewed.

[Add row]

### (7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

#### Row 1

##### (7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

NZ1

##### (7.54.3.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

##### (7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

##### (7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

Abs1

Abs2

Int1

##### (7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

### (7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

### (7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

*20241204\_Ingersoll Rand Inc\_Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf*

### (7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2
- Scope 3

### (7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

### (7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Ingersoll Rand Inc. commits to reduce absolute scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2050 from a 2020 base year. Ingersoll Rand Inc. also commits to reduce scope 3 GHG emissions from use of sold products 97% per USD value added within the same timeframe.*

### (7.54.3.11) Target objective

*Ingersoll Rand Inc. commits to reach net-zero greenhouse gas emissions across the value chain by 2050. Reducing overall emissions is directly linked to Ingersoll Rand's strategic imperative of sustainable growth.*

### (7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

Yes

### (7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

### (7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

No, we do not plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation

### (7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

*Ingersoll Rand's roadmap to net zero includes a potential need for purchasing carbon credits for a small (<5%) residual amount of emissions. Ingersoll Rand has a multi-year road map with several large projects for achieving our set targets. Our Green Excellence program (a behavior based multi-pillar approach to operational efficiencies led by site level technical experts) has been implemented at over 50% of our manufacturing facilities. We have added and expect to continue adding additional retail renewable electricity contracts and site level solar projects at our manufacturing facilities. The phasing out of high GWP refrigerants in our product testing has continued with an expected project completion date of late 2025. Our fleet has increased the number of hybrid and electric vehicles year-over-year and expect to electrify 50% of our fleet by 2030.*

### (7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

### (7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

*Ingersoll Rand recalculates its base year due to mergers and acquisitions on a yearly basis. As such, revalidation will take place when appropriate based on materiality to the target data.*

[Add row]

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

Select from:

Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	58	<i>`Numeric input</i>
To be implemented	21	141.84
Implementation commenced	20	3250.07
Implemented	127	1524.03
Not to be implemented	32	<i>`Numeric input</i>

[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

Other, please specify :GreenX Energy Reduction Projects (Behavior Based)

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1237.03

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

- Voluntary

### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

367749

### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2531077

### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

- 4-10 years

### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

- Ongoing

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Ingersoll Rand's Green Excellence program utilizes a multi-pillar approach to primarily behavior based energy efficiency projects.*

**Row 2**

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Transportation

- Company fleet vehicle efficiency

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

79.11

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

*Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

*Select from:*

- Voluntary

### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

72446

### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

*Select from:*

- No payback

### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

3-5 years

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Introduction of hybrid and electric vehicles into the IR fleet or reimbursed personal vehicle miles.*

## Row 4

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

Low-carbon electricity mix

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

50.08

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 1

Scope 2 (location-based)

Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

18988

**(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

46336

**(7.55.2.7) Payback period**

Select from:

1-3 years

**(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

Select from:

3-5 years

**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

*Retail renewable bundled contracts.*

**Row 5**

**(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in buildings

Lighting

**(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)**

28.79

**(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur**

Select all that apply

Scope 2 (location-based)

Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

#### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

12072

#### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

29567

#### (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

*LED light conversions.*

**Row 6**

#### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

35.8

#### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

*Select all that apply*

Scope 2 (location-based)

Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

*Select from:*

Voluntary

#### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

13921

#### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

64053

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

*Select from:*

4-10 years

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

*Select from:*

16-20 years

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*HVAC equipment upgrades and added controllers.*

### Row 7

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Smart control system

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

28.66

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

*Select all that apply*

Scope 2 (location-based)

Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

*Select from:*

Voluntary

### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3200

### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

- 1-3 years

### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

- 16-20 years

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Smart controller system for load management.*

## Row 8

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

- Compressed air

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

18.37

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

#### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

132567

#### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

789184

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

4-10 years

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

11-15 years

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Upgraded compressors and leak management systems.*

### Row 9

#### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

Motors and drives

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

**(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur**

Select all that apply

- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)

**(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory**

Select from:

- Voluntary

**(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

2538

**(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

850

**(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**

VFDs installed on blower systems.

## Row 10

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

Solar PV

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

9.72

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

*Select all that apply*

Scope 2 (location-based)

Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

*Select from:*

Voluntary

### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

301443

### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

82383

### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

*Select from:*

4-10 years

### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

- 16-20 years

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Install of solar panels at one facility.*

## Row 11

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

- Process optimization

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

3.24

### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

- Voluntary

### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

**(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

0

**(7.55.2.7) Payback period***Select from:* <1 year**(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative***Select from:* 16-20 years**(7.55.2.9) Comment***Process improvements.***Row 12****(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in production processes

 Machine/equipment replacement**(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)**

20.42

**(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur***Select all that apply*

- Scope 1
- Scope 2 (location-based)
- Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

- Voluntary

#### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

6620

#### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

33250

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

- 4-10 years

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

- 6-10 years

#### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Transition from natural gas boilers, heaters, etc. to electric.*

[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:

- Internal finance mechanisms

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Utilize standard processes for sustainability projects at IR. This process follows Ingersoll Rand's standard authorization for expenditures. Annually, Corporate issues climate goals in line with our 2030/2050 targets, to the business units which in-turn are required of the individual sites. The sites routinely identify climate-related projects in the company sustainability database and once a year during the planning process, select projects for implementation the following year. Capital and expense money is approved in the month in which it was planned. Sites track their project implementation in the company sustainability database against their stated climate goals.*

## Row 2

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

- Lower return on investment (ROI) specification

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*In certain circumstances, we will accept a lower return if it aligns with our GHG, water consumption and waste reduction goals.*

## Row 3

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

- Internal incentives/recognition programs

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Our Green Excellence program (a behavior based multi-pillar approach to operational efficiencies led by site level technical experts) and company-wide environmental goals that are incorporated into performance reviews at all levels of the company.*

[Add row]

## **(7.71) Does your organization assess the life cycle emissions of any of its products or services?**

### **(7.71.1) Assessment of life cycle emissions**

Select from:

Yes

### **(7.71.2) Comment**

*A small number of Ingersoll Rand products have previously undergone a full LCA. As data quality and obligations increase, further products will likely undergo a full LCA.*

[Fixed row]

## **(7.71.1) Provide details of how your organization assesses the life cycle emissions of its products or services.**

### **(7.71.1.1) Products/services assessed**

Select from:

All existing and new products/services

### **(7.71.1.2) Life cycle stage(s) most commonly covered**

Select from:

Use stage

### **(7.71.1.3) Methodologies/standards/tools applied**

Select all that apply

GHG Protocol Product Accounting & Reporting Standard

ISO 14040 & 14044

#### (7.71.1.4) Comment

*As part of Ingersoll Rand's Design for Sustainability program, all newly developed products and reconfigured products undergo a limited LCA for the use stage of the product. This is used compare to prior versions of the product or the industry standard. Additionally, all products are screened at the representative model/product grouping level for the use stage of the product on a yearly basis.*

*[Fixed row]*

#### (7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

No, I am not providing data

#### (7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

Yes

#### (7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

#### (7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

Group of products or services

#### (7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

Other, please specify :Avoided emissions were estimated based on the Scope 3 product use-stage analysis conducted in 2023 which accounts for the entire Ingersoll Rand product line.

### (7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

Other, please specify :Compressed Air, Vacuum, Dryers and Blowers

### (7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

*A significant portion, 66% of our products, offer resource efficiency benefits to our customers and consumers during their use-phase. Our products contribute to a range of positive impacts, including decreased energy and water consumption, reduced waste generation, lower greenhouse gas emissions, pollution reduction, decreased raw material consumption, and increased product durability and longevity. Example of some of these efficient products and services include: Rotary compressors, Centrifugal compressors, Blowers and vacuum systems, Variable frequency drive motors to improve efficiency (compressor, blower, vacuum), Dryers with low-GWP refrigerant, Heat of compression dryers, Heat recovery modules, Controller upgrades for improved efficiency, Air system assessments and components to reduce system losses, save energy, Electric Q-Drive compressors, Electric-operated PD pump, Dosatron water-powered dosing pumps, RunTech systems, Cordless tools, Hydrogen compressors and refueling stations, Hydrogen fuel cells, Industrial hydrogen compression, Biogas, recovery and compression systems, Waste grinding and conveyance for biogas production, Flare gas capture systems, Zero methane emission, natural gas odorizer, Blowers and vacuum pumps for captured carbon transmission for transport, Blowers for air cushion for ocean vessels, reduce friction, and less fuel consumption.*

### (7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

Yes

### (7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

Other, please specify :The avoided emissions are estimated based on Scope 3 product use-stage life cycle analysis (2020 baseline) conducted in 2023 and certain assumptions about customer usage and product benefits as compared to existing alternatives.

### (7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

Use stage

### (7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

MT CO2e

### (7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

*The avoided emissions are estimated based on Scope 3 product use-stage life cycle analysis (2020 baseline) conducted in 2024 and certain assumptions about customer usage and product benefits as compared to existing alternatives; emissions avoided for certain application-specific products (e.g., landfill biogas compressors) have not yet been calculated but would be incremental to the total shown.*

### (7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

Use stage

### (7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

3848169

### (7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

*As we build on our expertise and experience to deliver innovative energy and water efficient solutions for our customers, it will drive shareholder value. In 2024, Ingersoll Rand's percentage of total revenue from "climate change" product(s) was an estimated 51%. The estimated total avoided emissions per year was 3.8 million metric tons CO2e. The avoided emissions are estimated based on Scope 3 product use-stage life cycle analysis (2020 baseline) conducted in 2023 and certain assumptions about customer usage and product benefits as compared to existing alternatives; emissions avoided for certain application-specific products (e.g., landfill biogas compressors) have not yet been calculated but would be incremental to the total shown.*

### (7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

51

[Add row]

### (7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

No

## C9. Environmental performance - Water security

### (9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

##### Row 1

###### (9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

Facilities

###### (9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

*Some small service, repair, and administrative facilities are excluded from Ingersoll Rand's water consumption values. These are excluded due to lease agreements and the non-material nature of the activities in regards to impact on overall water consumption. Additionally, companies acquired within the last year are excluded from our environmental inventories until they have 12 months of data in our EHS database. All environmental metrics (including water) follow the same rebaselining procedure as carbon emissions.*

###### (9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

Data is not available

###### (9.1.1.4) Primary reason why data is not available

Select from:

Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

### (9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

- Less than 1%

### (9.1.1.8) Please explain

*Some small service, repair, and administrative facilities are excluded from Ingersoll Rand's water consumption values. These are excluded due to lease agreements and the non-material nature of the activities in regards to impact on overall water consumption. Additionally, companies acquired within the last year are excluded from our environmental inventories until they have 12 months of data in our EHS database. All environmental metrics (including water) follow the same rebaselining procedure as carbon emissions.*

*[Add row]*

## (9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

### Water withdrawals – total volumes

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

- 76-99

#### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

- Monthly

#### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Utility invoices and local meters.*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*On a monthly basis, water consumption is reported by most of our locations.*

## Water withdrawals – volumes by source

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Yearly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Utility invoices and local meters.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*On a monthly basis, water consumption is reported by most of our locations. On a yearly basis, the sources of the water are reviewed.*

## Water withdrawals quality

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

## Water discharges – total volumes

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

### Water discharges – volumes by destination

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

### Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

### Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

### Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

1-25

#### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Other, please specify :As required by permit.

#### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Point sampling.*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Locations with specific water discharge permits sample and track water quality on a frequency required by the permit.*

### Water discharge quality – temperature

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

## Water consumption – total volume

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Monthly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Utility invoices and local meters.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*On a monthly basis, water consumption is reported by most of our locations.*

## Water recycled/reused

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

## The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

Not monitored

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We do not monitor in centralized manner. Individual sites conduct sampling based on local requirements or needs.*

*[Fixed row]*

**(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?**

#### Total withdrawals

##### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

350

##### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

##### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

##### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

##### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Investment in water-smart technology/process

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand has multiple water consumption goals, one of which- water withdrawal (excluding saltwater) was achieved in 2024, resulting in over 6% reduction vs prior year. In the prior year, due to investment in closed-loop process systems, Ingersoll Rand reduced total water consumption by 29.4% in 2023 vs. 2022. In 2024, Ingersoll Rand continued to deliver on a new goal for water-stressed locations introduced in 2023, reducing the consumption by 8.1% vs 2023. The goal is to reduce water consumption by 30% by 2030 at our high-water risk locations.*

## Total discharges

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- About the same

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Unknown

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

- About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Unknown

## (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Continue the same output throughout the years.*

## Total consumption

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

350

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

## (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*To support our 30% water reduction goal in water-stressed areas, we have launched targeted initiatives across our sites. These include water metering in Changzhou, China, and process optimizations in Guilin, China, and Burbank, California. In Chennai, India, efficient spray hoses reduce canteen water use, while Chonburi, Thailand, reuses testing water in operations. Ocala, Florida, has upgraded to low-flow, hands-free fixtures.*

[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

137.99

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

39.43

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand reduced total water consumption in water-stressed areas by 8.1% in 2024 vs. 2023 based on the goal implemented in 2023 which is to reduce water consumption by 30% by 2030 at our high water risk locations.*

*[Fixed row]*

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

N/A

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

N/A

**Groundwater – renewable**

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

N/A

**Groundwater – non-renewable**

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

N/A

**Produced/Entrained water**

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

N/A

#### Third party sources

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

350

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

#### (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*Ingersoll Rand has multiple water consumption goals, one of which- water withdrawal (excluding saltwater) was achieved in 2024, resulting in over 6% reduction vs prior year. In the prior year, due to investment in closed-loop process systems, Ingersoll Rand reduced total water consumption by 29.4% in 2023 vs. 2022. In 2024, Ingersoll Rand continued to deliver on a new goal for water-stressed locations introduced in 2023, reducing the consumption by 8.1% vs 2023. The goal is to reduce water consumption by 30% by 2030 at our high-water risk locations.*

*[Fixed row]*

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization’s emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

	Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)	Categories of substances included	Please explain
	0	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticides	Not applicable

[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

87

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

26-50

(9.3.4) Please explain

A total of 87 of our locations are within "Extremely High" or "High" water risk areas. However, most (50) are very small service or administrative locations that would not be greatly impacted by water shortages. We have quantified the financial risk associated with all 87 locations.

## Upstream value chain

### (9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

### (9.3.4) Please explain

We have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are planning to evaluate the need to do so in the next 2 years. We focus on our operational sustainability and water goals through 2030.

[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

## Row 1

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 1

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Shandong-China

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

Huang He (Yellow River)

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

36.66826

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

117.02076

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

21.41

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

21.41

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

21.41

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

21.41

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 2**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 2

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Shanghai (Jiamei Road)-China*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Dominican Republic

Other, please specify :China Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

*31.29412*

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

*121.32027*

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.8

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.8

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.8

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.8

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 3

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

Facility 3

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Shanghai-China*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Dominican Republic

Other, please specify :China Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

31.230416

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

121.473701

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.3

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.3

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1.3

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 4****(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 4

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Wujiang-China*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Dominican Republic

Other, please specify :China Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.108888

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.680885

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

42.1

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

42.1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

42.1

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

42.1

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

## Row 5

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 5

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*RD-Shanghai-China*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

**(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin**

Dominican Republic

Other, please specify :China Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

31.00052

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

121.379391

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

2.47

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.47

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

2.47

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

2.47

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 6**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 6

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Bahadurgarh (Plot 6)-India

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Ganges - Brahmaputra

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.691376

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

76.931406

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.12

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.12

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.12

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.12

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.

## Row 7

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 7

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Bahadurgarh (Plot 83)-India

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Ganges - Brahmaputra

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.691376

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

76.931406

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

2.08

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

2.08

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

2.08

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

2.08

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

## Row 8

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 8

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Barcelona-Spain*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

**(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin**

Spain

Other, please specify :Spain, South and East Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

41.51526

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

2.37083

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.51

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.51

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.51

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.51

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

## Row 9

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 9

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Halle-Belgium*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Belgium

Other, please specify :Scheldt

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.754082

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

4.248554

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.18

#### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.18

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.18

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.18

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 10**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 10

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Naroda (Plant 1)-India*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Other, please specify :Sabarmati

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.068586

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

72.653596

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

15.04

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

15.04

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

15.04

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

15.04

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 11**

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 11

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Naroda (Plant 2)-India

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Other, please specify :Sabarmati

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.022505

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

72.571362

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.38

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.38

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.38

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.38

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 12

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

*Select from:*

Facility 12

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Pune-India*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

*Select from:*

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

*Select all that apply*

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Godavari

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

20.593684

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

78.96288

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.33

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.33

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1.33

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 13****(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 13

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Wasquehal-France*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

France

Other, please specify :Scheldt

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.672614

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

3.134647

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.48

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.48

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

2.48

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2.48

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

## Row 14

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 14

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*RD-Bangalore-India*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Cauvery River

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.924485

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.601258

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.55

#### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3.55

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

3.55

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

3.55

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

This is our first year of measurement

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 15**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 15

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Douai-France

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

France

Other, please specify :Scheldt

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.367874

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

3.080602

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.5

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

0.5

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.5

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.5

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.

## Row 16

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 16

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Sahibabad-India

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Ganges - Brahmaputra

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.672359

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

77.349131

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

5.25

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

5.25

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

5.25

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

5.25

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 17

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 17

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Burbank, CA-USA*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

**(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin**

United States of America

Other, please specify :LA River Watershed

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

34.171771

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

-118.299709

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.57

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.57

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.57

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.57

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 18**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 18

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Chennai-India*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

Other, please specify :India East Coast

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

13.037336

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

80.21449

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.62

#### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.62

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

2.62

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

2.62

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 19**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 19

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Wuxi-China*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Dominican Republic

- Other, please specify :China Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.49099

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.31237

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1.9

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.9

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1.9

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 20**

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 20

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Miami Gardens, FL-USA

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Other, please specify :Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.916363

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-80.277517

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.55

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

0.55

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.55

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.55

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 21

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 21

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Mocksville, NC-USA*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Other, please specify :Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

35.894026

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

-80.561449

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

11.17

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

11.17

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

11.17

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

- About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 23**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

- Facility 24

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Springfield, MO-USA*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

- Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

- Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Mississippi River

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

37.208957

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-93.292299

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3.46

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3.46

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

3.46

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.46

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

## Row 24

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 25

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Bad Neustadt Saale-Germany*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

**(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin**

Germany

Rhine

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

50.329727

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

10.206442

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.26

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1.26

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.26

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.26

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 25**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 26

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Heerlen-Netherlands

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Netherlands

Rhine

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.930876

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

5.950559

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.16

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

0.16

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.16

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.16

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.

## Row 26

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 27

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Nuremberg-Germany

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

Rhine

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

11.076665

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.17

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.17

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.17

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.17

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 27

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 28

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Southern Pines, NC-USA*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Other, please specify :Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

35.174047

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-79.392254

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.59

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2.59

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

2.59

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

2.59

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Lower

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 28**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 29

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*RD-Hampton, NJ-USA*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Other, please specify :North Atlantic Coast

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.632574

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-74.885003

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

#### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.01

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.01

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 29**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 30

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Alsip, IL-USA*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

St. Lawrence

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.66499

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-87.720648

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1.62

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.62

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1.62

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.62

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 30**

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 31

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Clearwater, FL-USA

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Other, please specify :Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

27.965572

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-82.795895

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.16

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

0.16

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.16

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.16

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

Much lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 31

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 32

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Deerfield Beach, FL-USA*

#### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

#### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

#### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

Other, please specify :Gulf of Mexico, North Atlantic Coast

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

26.29838

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

-80.126355

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.01

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.01

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.01

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

- About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 32**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

- Facility 33

**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

*MFG-Frankfurt-Germany*

**(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage**

Select from:

- Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

Select all that apply

- Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

Rhine

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.110922

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

8.682127

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

#### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

#### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

#### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.05

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.05

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

## Row 33

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 34

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Ilmenau-Germany*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

**(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility**

*Select all that apply*

Risks

**(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year**

*Select from:*

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

**(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin**

Germany

Elbe River

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

50.68435

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

10.925473

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

*Select from:*

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.48

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.48

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.48

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.48

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

**Row 34**

**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 35

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Shanghai (Xuanzhong Rd)- China

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Dominican Republic

Other, please specify :China Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.029065

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.704082

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

1.3

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

1.3

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

1.3

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

1.3

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.

## Row 35

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 36

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

MFG-Stutzerbach-Germany

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Germany

Elbe River

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

50.634368

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

10.860821

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

0.21

**(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes**

0

**(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable**

0

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

0

**(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)**

0.21

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

About the same

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

0

**(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater**

0

**(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater**

0

**(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations**

0.21

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

0.21

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

- About the same

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

### Row 36

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 37

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*MFG-Tuggerah-Australia*

### (9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

### (9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Risks

### (9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

Other, please specify :Australia, East Coast

### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.30905

### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

151.42813

### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

Yes

### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0.09

### (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

### (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

### (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0.09

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

### (9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0.09

### (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.09

### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Lower consumption-Assume most water consumed is discharged (mostly process water)-All water is tracked via utility invoices.*

*[Add row]*

**(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?**

**Water withdrawals – total volumes**

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Total consumption only.*

**Water withdrawals – volume by source**

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Total consumption only.*

## Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Total consumption only.*

## Water discharges – total volumes

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Total consumption only.*

## Water discharges – volume by destination

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Total consumption only.*

**Water discharges – volume by final treatment level**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Total consumption only.*

**Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

Not verified

**(9.3.2.3) Please explain**

*Total consumption only.*

**Water consumption – total volume**

**(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000  
[Fixed row]

### (9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

This is confidential

### (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	7235000000	20671428.57	Decrease

[Fixed row]

### (9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

Row 1

#### (9.12.1) Product name

Not applicable

#### (9.12.2) Water intensity value

0

#### (9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Other, please specify :n/a

#### (9.12.4) Denominator

0

#### (9.12.5) Comment

n/a

[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

#### (9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

Yes

#### (9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

Products and services that are engineered, manufactured, and delivered to minimize freshwater use and water pollution across their entire lifecycle—from raw material sourcing to end-of-life disposal—while maintaining high performance and reliability in industrial applications.

#### (9.14.4) Please explain

Comparative analysis vs. the market alternative.

[Fixed row]

#### (9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	We do not plan to have targets for this metric within the next two years due to no instruction from management.
Water withdrawals	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	We do not plan to have targets for this metric within the next two years due to no instruction from management.
Other	Select from:	We do not plan to have targets for this metric within the next two years due to no instruction from management.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	

[Fixed row]

## (9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

### Row 1

#### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 2

#### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Site/facility

#### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

Reduction in total water withdrawals

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

05/01/2024

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

12/31/2020

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

39967182

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2030

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

27788027

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

36453988

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Underway

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

29

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

None, alignment not assessed

**(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*Reduced overall water use at water-stressed sites by 30% by 2030.*

#### **(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*Closed loop systems, domestic water usage decreases.*

#### **(9.15.2.16) Further details of target**

*Extremely High and High baseline water risk locations according to the WRI risk database.*

### **Row 2**

#### **(9.15.2.1) Target reference number**

*Select from:*

Target 1

#### **(9.15.2.2) Target coverage**

*Select from:*

Organization-wide (direct operations only)

#### **(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

Water withdrawals

Reduction in total water withdrawals

#### **(9.15.2.4) Date target was set**

*05/01/2020*

#### **(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

*12/31/2020*

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

148632368

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2030

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

123364865

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

92341439

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

Achieved

**(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year**

223

**(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target**

Select all that apply

None, alignment not assessed

**(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

Reduced overall water use by 17% by 2030.

**(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target**

*Closed loop systems at main consumer of water for production.*

### **(9.15.2.16) Further details of target**

*Closed loop systems at main consumer of water for production.*

*[Add row]*

## C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

	Targets in place	Please explain
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, but we plan to within the next two years	Plastics constitute less than 1% of raw materials (Polymers and Composites) therefore no targets have been established at this time.

[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

(10.2.2) Comment

Not applicable

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

**Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)**

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

**Production/commercialization of plastic packaging**

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

**Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics**

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

## (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

**Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)**

## (10.2.1) Activity applies

*Select from:*

No

## (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

**Provision of waste management and/or water management services**

## (10.2.1) Activity applies

*Select from:*

No

## (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

**Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities**

## (10.2.1) Activity applies

*Select from:*

No

## (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

## Other activities not specified

### (10.2.1) Activity applies

*Select from:*

No

### (10.2.2) Comment

*Not applicable*

*[Fixed row]*

## C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

### (11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

### (11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

Land/water protection

Land/water management

Species management

Education & awareness

Law & policy

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years

[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	Comment
Legally protected areas	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable
UNESCO World Heritage sites	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable
Ramsar sites	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable
Key Biodiversity Areas	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable
Other areas important for biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Not applicable

[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
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

### Row 1

#### (13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Climate change

#### (13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Introduction

Other data point in module 1, please specify :GHG emissions Scope 1, 2, 3. Environmental Data and Safety Performance metrics.

#### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

ISAE 3000

#### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*ERM Certification & Verification Services Incorporated performed a limited assurance engagement, in accordance with the International Standard on Assurance Engagements ISAE 3000 (Revised) 'Assurance Engagements other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. The procedures performed in a limited assurance engagement vary in nature and timing from, and are less in extent than for a reasonable assurance engagement, and consequently, the level of assurance obtained in a limited assurance engagement is substantially lower than the assurance that would have been obtained had a reasonable assurance engagement been performed.*

#### (13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

*ERM CVS – Limited Assurance Report for Ingersoll Rand Sustainability Report 2024.pdf*

[Add row]

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

	Additional information	Attachment (optional)
	N/A	<i>2024 Environmental, Safety, and Product Use Phase Assurance Statement.pdf</i>

[Fixed row]

**(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.**

#### (13.3.1) Job title

*senior vice president, general counsel, chief compliance officer, and secretary*

### **(13.3.2) Corresponding job category**

*Select from:*

General Counsel

*[Fixed row]*

**(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.**

*Select from:*

No





# Ingersoll Rand CDP Update – 2025 Data



## Climate Change Physical Risk Assessment

**Risks driven by change in physical climate parameters or other climate-change related developments:**

**Currency: USD**

**Brief Description:**

We have sites in water stressed areas. Our ability to produce in these areas could be limited by water availability or limitations on the use of water by government agencies. We have estimated the financial implication of this risk as the total loss of revenue from these sites. However, we estimate the actual cost of mitigating this risk to be significantly less. Possible mitigation options include shifting production to non-stressed areas, water reclamation, rainwater harvesting, process efficiency improvements, etc.

**Estimated financial implication of the risk before taking action (Monetary Units):**

\$1,502,364,687

**Average estimated time frame (in number of years) for financial implications of the risk:**

8

**Estimated costs of these actions (Monetary Units): \$7,500,000**