



Reworld Holding Corporation

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

.

Contents

C1. Introduction.....	8
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?	8
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.	8
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.	8
(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.....	8
(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?	9
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.	9
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?	9
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.	11
(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	11
(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities.	12
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?	68
(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?	69
C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities	71
(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?	71
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?	72
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?	73
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.....	73
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?	77
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?	77
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?	78
(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?	80
(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.	80

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 83

(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?.....	83
(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.	83
(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.	91
(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?	93
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?	94
(3.3.1) Provide the total number and financial value of all water-related fines.	94
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?	95
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.	95
(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.	95
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?	98
(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?	98
(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.	99
(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.	104

C4. Governance 106

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?	106
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?	106
(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.	107
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?	110
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?	111
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	111
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?	114
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	115
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?	118

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.	118
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?	120
(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?	120
(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?	120
(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?	124
(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.	124

C5. Business strategy..... 126

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?	126
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?	127
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?	129
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.	129
(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.	132
(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?	133
(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.	134
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?	135
(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon.	135
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?	137
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?	138
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?	139
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?	139
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.	139
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.	141
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?	145

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach 146

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.....	146
--	-----

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change.....	148
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....	148
(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?.....	148
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?	148
(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?....	149
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.	149
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.	150
(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?	151
(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.	151
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.	155
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO ₂ e?	162
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO ₂ e?	163
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.	163
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.	172
(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?	172
(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.	173
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?	179
(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO ₂	179
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?	179
(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).	179
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.	181
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	181
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.	181
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	182
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.	182
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.	183

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?.....	183
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.	184
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?.....	187
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	188
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?	188
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.	189
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.	189
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.	191
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.	192
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.	199
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.	201
(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.	202
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.	204
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?	205
(7.53.3) Explain why you did not have an emissions target, and forecast how your emissions will change over the next five years.	205
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?	206
(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.	206
(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.	210
(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.	211
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.	211
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?	212
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?.....	214
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?	214
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.	214
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?.....	217
(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.	218

C9. Environmental performance - Water security..... 222

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?	222
(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.	222
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?	223
(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?	229
(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.	232
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.	233
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.	236
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.	239
(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.	242
(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?	243
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?	244
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.	244
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?	244
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?	244
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?	245
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.	245
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.	246
C10. Environmental performance - Plastics	249
(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?	249
(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.	249
C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity	253
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	253
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?	253
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?	253
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.	256

C13. Further information & sign off 263

(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? 263

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? 263

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. 265

(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..... 265

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:

☒ Privately owned organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Reworld™ is a leader in sustainable waste solutions, providing innovative and environmentally responsible services to a global community. Reworld™ is committed to advancing zero waste initiatives and supporting sustainability goals through state-of-the-art technologies that reimagine, reduce, reuse, recycle, recover and renew. For more information, visit www.reworldwaste.com.

[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2024	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

2700000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

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:

☒ No

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:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

00-132-8053

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

☒ Canada

☒ United States of America

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☒ Yes, for some facilities	All Reworld facility locations may be found on our facility map: https://www.reworldwaste.com/where-we-are

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

58th Street

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.9323

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.224317

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Abington

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.12067

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.11795

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Alexandria

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.801404

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.126456

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Arkadelphia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.062112

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-93.096828

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Asheboro-Carl Drive

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.763886

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.818137

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Maintenance or Operations Facility

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Asheboro-Fayetteville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.772739

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.808268

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Augusta

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.353321

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.969205

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Avon

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.471616

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.017062

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 9**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Avon Lake

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.481297

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.042739

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 10**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Babylon

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.73397

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.386205

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bay Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.651306

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.065499

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bayport

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.609998

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.058467

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 13**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Bedford

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.372878

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.52974

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 14**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Birmingham

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.629488

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.733658

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 15**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Bondi Island LF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.079867

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.686714

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Landfill

Row 16**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Braintree

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.20547

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.998983

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 17**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Bristol

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.649477

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.916083

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 18**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Brookhaven

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.836765

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.917049

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 19**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Camden

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.912558

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.117277

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 20**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Cedar Rapids

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.91839

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-91.676947

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chambly

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.416292

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.285943

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chemical Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.618042

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.054024

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 23**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

CMW LF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.814142

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.720774

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Landfill

Row 24**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

College Ave

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.120926

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.041647

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Danvers

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.556646

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.98185

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Delaware Valley

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.826578

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.386608

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 27**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Detroit

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.457538

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.005386

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 28**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Dolton-Greenwood

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.627112

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.59883

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 29

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dolton-Maryland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.627255

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.596993

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Durham York

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.972593

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-93.177718

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 31**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

East 91st Street MTS

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.778554

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.945082

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 32**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

East Taunton MPF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.90495

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.990482

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Essex

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.734451

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.126994

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fairfax

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.691334

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.237756

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 35**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Fairless Hills

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.178142

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.856445

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 36**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Fox Valley-Oshkosh

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.051698

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.537724

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fox Valley-Winneconne

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.110946

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.713652

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 38

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fulton (Paterson)

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.923638

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.166721

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 39**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Galena Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.733562

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.230212

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Administrative Support Building

Row 40**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Gary Airport Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.627548

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.418777

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Maintenance or Operations Facility

Row 41**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Gary Michigan St

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.592613

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.312545

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 42**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Global Remediation

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.90495

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.990482

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Administrative Support Building

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Griffith

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.520503

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.408174

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Harrisburg

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.245439

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.85035

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Haverhill

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.765679

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.123464

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hempstead

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.738167

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.590596

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 47**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Hillsborough

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

27.94776

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.458444

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 48**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Hodgkins

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.781442

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.856721

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 49**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Holliston

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.218902

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.41409

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 50**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Honey Brook

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.100427

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.921912

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Administrative Support Building

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

HPower

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

21.306721

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-158.103542

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Huntington

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.880967

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.289702

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 53**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Huntsville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.669669

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.612162

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 54**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Hyde Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.119986

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.035052

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Maintenance or Operations Facility

Row 55**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Indianapolis

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.734193

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.189276

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 56**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Indianapolis MPF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.729359

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.225102

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 57**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Jacksonville

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.737021

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.236672

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 58**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Kenosha

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.593875

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.893757

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 59

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Kitchener

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.420535

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.254567

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 60

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

La Porte Highway 146 HQ

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.660946

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.029735

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Administrative Support Building

Row 61**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

La Porte Highway 225 (Strang)

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.665784

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.019373

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 62**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

La Porte Marine Terminal

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.702613

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.047071

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 63**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Lake

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

28.740275

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.889462

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 64**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Lancaster

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.129458

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.686337

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 65

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lee

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

26.635403

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.75354

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 66

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lower Merion

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.027434

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.2427

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 67

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lynn

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.454134

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.957568

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 68

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

MacArthur

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.786514

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.106189

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 69

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Manheim

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.12483

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.16629

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 70

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Marion

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.047891

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-122.962824

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 71

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Medina

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.136202

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.891276

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 72

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Milwaukee

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.113879

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.95297

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 73

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mohawk

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.161976

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.38446

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 74

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Montgomery

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.200742

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.45636

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 75

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Montgomery TS

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.121626

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.176082

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 76

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Myerstown

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.362803

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.327106

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 77

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Newcastle-101 River Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.012612

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.358261

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 78

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Newcastle-61 River Park

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.013475

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.359042

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 79**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Niagara

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.083565

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.007629

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 80**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Niles

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.028932

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.812235

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Maintenance or Operations Facility

Row 81**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

North Shore MTS

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.75559

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-73.81188

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 82**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Onondaga

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.992011

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.071589

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 83

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Packard Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.097936

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.004266

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 84

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Palm Beach REF 1

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

26.76683

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.141104

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 85

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Palm Beach REF 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

26.79922

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.137052

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 86

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pasco

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

28.369321

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.560147

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 87

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Peabody LF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.530761

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.982556

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Landfill

Row 88

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pinellas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

27.875015

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.681325

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 89**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Plymouth

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.095888

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.310494

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 90**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Portage

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.594095

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.197607

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 91

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Portland MPF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.568306

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.641722

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 92

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Quarry Road

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.123918

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-78.968958

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 93**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

River Street (Paterson)

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.924132

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.167544

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 94**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Rockford

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.247658

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-89.0954

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Maintenance or Operations Facility

Row 95**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

SEConn

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.474808

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.067559

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 96**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

SEMass-RRF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.780863

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.743803

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 97**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

St. Louis

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.860828

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.521972

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 98**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Stanislaus

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.391439

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-121.086024

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 99**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Sumter Highway 15

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.68772

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-78.923251

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 100**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Sumter Lynette 1880

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.871991

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.382383

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 101

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sumter Lynette 1881

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.871885

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.382546

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 102

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sumter Transportation

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.920435

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-80.341469

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 103**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Tampa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

27.96049

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.377617

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 104**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Texarkana

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

33.406791

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-94.093532

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 105**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Tonawanda

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.967377

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-78.887858

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 106**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Totowa TS

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.902039

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.245815

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 107**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Tulsa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.133339

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-96.016033

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 108**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Tulsa MPF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.107935

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.993653

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant

Row 109**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Union

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.608159

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.277647

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 110**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

Yarmouth

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.685733

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.212783

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Leased - Transport Depot or Hub

Row 111**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

York

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.001658

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.717802

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Operated - Waste-to-Energy Facility

Row 112**(1.8.1.1) Identifier**

York MPF

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.975562

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-76.703239

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owned - Waste Sorting / Recycling Plant
[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

☒ Downstream 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

Reworld is in the business of managing waste sustainably for our clients, to find the best possible uses of a given waste stream and reduce the risk associated with handling it. As such, our business has a clear material (and energy) flow in and out of our facilities. Our upstream value chain includes companies that supply materials and equipment to maintain facility operations (e.g. fuel, reagent, repair materials) as well as our waste customers that provide materials for processing. These have been mapped up to Tier 1; the final product delivered to us for use. Our downstream value chain includes any use of recycled materials from our extraction processes (e.g. metals, water, petroleum, organics), customer electricity and steam use, and any further disposal options (e.g. ash treatment, any landfilled residue)

[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

- ☒ End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply

- ☒ Preparation for reuse
- ☒ Recycling
- ☒ Waste to Energy
- ☒ Incineration
- ☒ 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)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

It is the same.

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

It is the same.

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)

20

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

It is the same.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water
- ☒ 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
- ☒ Upstream value chain
- ☒ Downstream value chain
- ☒ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Partial

(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:

- ☒ As important matters arise

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term

- ☒ Medium-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
- ☒ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ Life Cycle Assessment

Other

- ☒ Desk-based research
- ☒ Internal company methods
- ☒ Materiality assessment

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☒ Pollution incident

Chronic physical

- ☒ Declining water quality
- ☒ Groundwater depletion
- ☒ Increased severity of extreme weather events

Policy

- ☒ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☒ Changes to national legislation
- ☒ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

Market

- ☒ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

- ☒ Stigmatization of sector

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | |
| ☒ Investors | |
| ☒ 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

Risks, Opportunities, Impacts and Dependencies are all interconnected. Our Board's dedicated Risk committee serves to identify and review the risks across the company, including those associated with the Environment and Climate Change. This is managed through our company Risk Matrix, which included the topics of climate change and policy in 2023. Further, our Chief Sustainability Officer reviews pertinent aspects of the sustainability program with the Board's Environmental Justice and Sustainability committee, including climate change and GHG emissions. This regular interaction is important to ensure recognition of potential risks and opportunities regarding climate change.

[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

Risks, Opportunities, Impacts and Dependencies are viewed as inherently interconnected. We approach challenges with the mindset of finding an opportunity in other areas. For example, we have experienced supply chain disruptions for reagents such as lime and carbon (risk, dependency), used in our Thermomechanical Treatment Facility (TTF) operations. We took the opportunity to review our suppliers and potential new products that have a lower carbon footprint. Recent testing indicated that a bio-based activated carbon alternative ("Carbonxt") can replace our use of traditionally fossil-based carbon. The switch opens our supplier options and offers GHG savings (opportunity, impact).

[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

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

(2.3.7) Primary reason for not identifying priority locations

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(2.3.8) Explain why you do not identify priority locations

Identifying priority locations as they relate to nature related impacts is not a strategic priority at this time. Our facilities face similar challenges in terms of climate change and access to resources.

[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:

☒ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☒ Absolute decrease

(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

For purposes of determining environmental risks, we define substantive financial or strategic impact as impacts that could be expected to create a material financial impact consistent with relevant financial reporting and disclosure standards, impact our ability to operate our current facilities or pursue development opportunities, or create a significant change in the demand for our products or services.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Qualitative
- ☒ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- ☒ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- ☒ Absolute increase

(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

For purposes of determining environmental opportunities, we define substantive financial or strategic opportunity as one that could be expected to improve our ability to pursue development opportunities or offer new products / services to our customers.

[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

Our facilities offer a variety of wastewater treatment options, from pre-treatment to reuse, to help our clients reduce the risk associated with their liquid/water waste. Inbound wastewaters are profiled by an internal waste stream approvals team, which assesses generator information and lab data in order to determine whether our permits and or processes can handle it. Liquid waste streams are also checked for several parameters when received to ensure compatibility and treatability.
[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

Our customers, including petroleum refineries, generate oily water waste in their own operations. We manage this waste on their behalf in order to reduce their risk of potentially improper disposal.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- ☒ Resource recovery
- ☒ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
- ☒ Water recycling
- ☒ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

We operate facilities that specialize in oily water recycling through oil /water separation. The extracted petroleum is resold for refinement or fuel blending and the remaining water is further treated to be discharged to POTW.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- ☒ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Reworld pre-treats 250M gallons of wastewater and beneficially reuses an additional 30M gallons of wastewater in our operations, every year. This service offering reduces the risk of improper disposal for our clients. Our analytics capabilities and various water management solutions provide multiple outlets for our customers. We pre-treat wastewater through pH adjustment, flocculation, sedimentation and filtration.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Downstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- ☒ Resource recovery
- ☒ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
- ☒ Water recycling
- ☒ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Many of our Material Processing Facilities (MPFs) are equipped with wastewater pre-treatment capabilities. Water must be treated to meet the facility's permit limits and POTW limits before discharging to POTW. Parameters include pH, suspended solids, and other physical contaminants. We can also pre-treat these waters to beneficially reuse them in our direct operations. 30M gallons a year are used in Reworld TTFs to replace freshwater use.

[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?

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Water	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Plastics	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[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

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

TTFs are a net source of GHG mitigation relative to the business-as-usual practice of landfilling, as recognized by many international organizations and protocols, including the EU, U.S. EPA, and CDM carbon offset methodologies. However, TTFs also have stack emissions of CO2 which can be subject to regulation if only viewed from a fenceline basis without understanding the broader benefits to overall GHG emissions that accrue outside of the fence line. Because of the potential exposure, we are constantly evaluating our exposure to emerging regulations, legislation, and policy. For example, in 2019, NY State passed the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act (CLCPA). While the state's work in implementing the CLCPA so far places the focus on avoiding landfilling and recognizes the need for continued TTF capacity, several key mechanisms are currently under development, including a potential cap & Invest program, which could have significant negative impacts on our operations if not developed correctly. California's cap & trade program was a case study in a poorly designed program for the waste sector, which, despite the state's own recognition of the GHG benefits of TTFs, exempted landfills from the cap & trade portion of the program, while fully including TTF emissions. As California itself admitted, this created a perverse incentive to divert waste from TTFs to landfills, leading to increased emissions.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Medium-term

☒ 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

(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

As is the case with all combustion processes, our facilities emit CO₂, however TTFs are recognized as a net GHG mitigation technology, because it: • avoids methane emissions from landfills • avoids CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel power plants using wasted material as solid fuel; • and avoids GHG emissions from mining and metal processing because it recovers and recycles metals from waste. If NY's Cap & Invest program were designed to recognize the inherent benefit of diverting waste from landfills to TTFs, then the program would provide a financial incentive to the continued operation and development of TTFs. However, if the program did not provide such a level playing field on the basis of GHG emissions, instead included in a carbon pricing / trading scheme while exempting landfills as was done in California, the profitability of operating the sites could be impacted. If the profitability was impacted so greatly that we would have to cease operations, the waste that would have been managed at TTFs would have to be redirected to landfills, which would generate more GHGs and result in less recovered energy and materials.

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

Select from:

☒ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☒ Align organization's public policy engagement with its environmental strategy

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

As a privately held company, financial figures will not be provided in this report.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

For policy makers at the local level who make decisions on sustainable waste management alternatives, using TTFs instead of landfilling will result in significantly lower net GHG emissions, while also introducing more control over the cost of waste management and supply of local renewable electrical power. We are actively engaged in encouraging policy makers at state and federal levels to enact legislation that supports TTF as a superior choice for communities to avoid both the environmental harm caused by landfilling waste and reduce local reliance on fossil fuels as a source of energy. Several jurisdictions are looking at carbon policies, including Oregon and Pennsylvania. New York passed the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act in 2019 which will require significant reductions in GHG emissions in the state by 2050. Because we have 6 facilities in the state, we have been actively engaged in the regulatory development process, including through participation in a state-led waste sector working group by appointment by the state's environmental regulator and through comments on the State's proposed cap & invest program and solid waste plan. The State has recognized that the main source of GHG emissions from the waste sector is methane from organic waste decomposition in landfills. Given TTF's international recognition as a means of reducing GHG emissions by avoiding methane from the waste management sector, we expect TTFs have an important role to play in the transition to a net zero economy; however, the exact impact on our business in New York is uncertain at this time.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☒ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Brazos River

☒ Fraser River

☒ Hudson River

☒ St. Lawrence

☒ Pee Dee River

☒ St. Johns River

☒ Mississippi River

☒ Trinity River (Texas)

☒ Alabama River & Tombigbee

☒ Sacramento River - San Joaquin River

☒ Potomac River

☒ Columbia River

☒ Delaware River

☒ Cape Fear River

☒ Merrimack River

☒ Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We operate water-pretreatment operations across the country to return our customers' wastewater to the natural water cycle. These facilities discharge to publicly owned treatment works (POTW) and the discharged waters from our facilities are subjected to additional treatment prior to their discharge into receiving waters. These operations run very well, but do run the risk of exceeding discharge permit limits and incurring fines, damaging reputation, etc. We rely on our environmental management systems, material profiling and auditing processes, and employee training to ensure waste is managed as required. We've included all the river basins in which we operate, not just the basins in which this specific risk occurs.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Fines, penalties or enforcement orders

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

Select all that apply

☒ Short-term

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

Select from:

☒ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-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

Water-related fines are not in and of-themselves cost prohibitive; the reputational impacts are. Our customers rely on us for safe, compliant disposal in order to reduce their own risk. If we do not meet that expectation we risk losing their business.

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

Select from:

☒ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☒ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

As a privately held company, financial figures will not be provided in this report.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Environmental excellence is the cornerstone of our service offerings. This requires the maintenance of our robust environmental management program and diligent team members. The recent regionalization of our company has brought senior leadership closer to facility operations, and more resources to prevent exceedances.

Plastics

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Technology

☒ Other technology risk, please specify

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We operate water-pretreatment operations across the country to return our customers' wastewater to the natural water cycle. These facilities discharge to publicly owned treatment works (POTW) and the discharged waters from our facilities are subjected to additional treatment prior to their discharge into receiving waters. These operations run very well, but do run the risk of exceeding discharge permit limits and incurring fines, damaging reputation, etc. We rely on our environmental management systems, material profiling and auditing processes, and employee training to ensure waste is managed as required. We've included all the river basins in which we operate, not just the basins in which this specific risk occurs.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Disruption to sales

(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:

☒ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ 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

As GHG limiting regulation are implemented, higher scope 1 emissions could translate to higher operating costs.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☒ Take action to switch to plastic which is recyclable in practice and at scale

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We are supporters of plastic recycling and reduction initiatives, including extended producer responsibility. Access to reliable plastic alternatives and recycling outlets can prevent it from growing in the disposal waste stream. In our advisory arm of the business, our greatest advice to customers looking for plastic management

outlets is to change their upstream operations. Swapping to more recyclable plastic types and improving processes to reduce contamination will overall improve the economic viability of plastic recycling.
[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)

0

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

Select from:

☒ 11-20%

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

0

(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 a privately held company, financial figures will not be provided in this report.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Liabilities

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

0

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

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

0

(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 a privately held company, financial figures will not be provided in this report.

[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

United States of America

☒ St. Lawrence

(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

24

(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:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

It is very unlikely that the identified compliance risks result in substantive financial impact. The St. Lawrence River water basin represents our basin with the "most risk," as it contains more of our facilities than any other basin. However, the water-related risks in the St. Lawrence River water basin are negligible, with such water risks at most affecting less than 1% of the organization's total revenue. As such, other basins in which we have facilities are excluded, as risk in those basins will also be de minimis.

[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?

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.3.2) Fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties

Select all that apply

☒ Fines, but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

Across the fleet, we received 3 notices of violation (NOVs) for violations associated with our stormwater permits and 1 administrative consent order (ACO) related to a localized water main break and associated reporting/notification procedures.

[Fixed row]

(3.3.1) Provide the total number and financial value of all water-related fines.

(3.3.1.1) Total number of fines

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

41295

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

2

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

(3.3.1.5) Comment

In 2023, we had 5 NOVs, resulting in one fine of \$5,000. The ACO is responsible for the higher total of fines in 2024.
[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:

☒ Yes

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.

Select all that apply

☒ California CaT - ETS

☒ RGGI - ETS

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.

California CaT - ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

1.46

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2024

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2024

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

66875

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

58523

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☒ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

CA Cap & trade program compliance periods are 3 years, with the current period from 2024 - 2026.

RGGI - ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

0.2

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2024

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2024

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

9779

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

12000

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

9065

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☒ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Reworld operates two natural gas-fired boilers at our Niagara Falls, NY facility that are used as back-up sources of steam for an industrial park steam loop. They are identified as Boiler 1 (high-pressure boiler) and Boiler 5 (low-pressure boiler). While the use of these boilers satisfies steam demand, the high-pressure output of Boiler 1 is connected to a turbine with a rating of 25MW. Therefore, according to RGGI rules, all of the emissions from Boiler 1 are subject to the program. Boiler 5 is a low-pressure boiler that cannot generate electricity and is therefore, not subject to RGGI.

[Fixed row]

(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?

Reworld is subject to the RGGI cap and trade program for an auxiliary boiler installed at our Niagara Falls, NY facility. Our current strategy is to purchase allowances needed through the secondary market. Our core business, TTF (WTE), is not subject to the RGGI cap and trade program. Therefore, we currently have minimal market exposure to this program. In 2017, Reworld was effectively exempt from the California cap and trade program under AB32; however, beginning in 2018, our Stanislaus County facility in Crows Landing, CA started to incur a compliance obligation. While the facility receives the majority of its allowances directly from the state as a free allocation, there is a shortfall of allowances provided relative to our compliance obligation. To make up the shortfall, we purchase either allowances, offsets, or offset derivative products from the secondary market. In addition to securing allowances to remain compliant, we are engaged with the California Air Resource Board and other policymakers to ensure the climate benefits of TTF are properly considered.

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

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

	Environmental opportunities identified
Water	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ 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

☒ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☒ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

With our recent acquisitions and growing network of third-party partners, we see an opportunity to develop and expand the sale of our sustainable waste management services, which provide a multitude of environmental benefits to our clients.

(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

☒ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☒ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium

(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

Customers are increasingly looking for sustainable, local options to manage their waste and reduce their own operational risk. Continued expansion in this area can lead to greater sales, longer term relationships and enhanced reputation in the waste management sector. The full integration of our 8 recently acquired facilities and the regionalization of the business are helping us bring closer solutions to clients in a timely manner.

(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 privately held company, we will not be providing financial figures in this report. Additionally, we are already engaged in expanding our services and increasing sales.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

In addition to our focus on TTFs and related waste sourcing activities, we have actively expanded our service offerings through our recent 8 acquisitions. Specifically, we have grown our offerings in commercial/industrial wastewater treatment, alternative fuel blending for cement kilns and various recycling and reuse outlets (oil, product packaging, animal bedding, pallets) to help our customers further reduce their environmental footprint. As part of our sustainability-linked financing terms, we have committed to grow both the waste that we process sustainably (SLF KPI 1) by 2.5%, and wastes we recycle and reuse (SLF KPI 2) by 25% relative to a 2020 baseline by 2025.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☒ Expansion into new markets

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

- ☒ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☒ Brazos River | ☒ Columbia River |
| ☒ Fraser River | ☒ Delaware River |
| ☒ Hudson River | ☒ Savannah River |
| ☒ Pee Dee River | ☒ Cape Fear River |
| ☒ Potomac River | ☒ Mackenzie River |
| ☒ Merrimack River | |
| ☒ Mississippi River | |
| ☒ Alabama River & Tombigbee | |
| ☒ Sacramento River - San Joaquin River | |
| ☒ Other, please specify | |

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Expanded water recycle / reuse opportunities.

(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

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Medium-low

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

Our recent acquisitions of Globalcycle and Circon have, in particular, opened new water recycling opportunities for us. In our first year operating these facilities, we have over doubled our capacity to recycle and reuse customer wastewater. In 2023, we separated and recycled 18M gallons of petroleum, recycled 250M gallons of wastewater, and beneficially reused 30M gallons of wastewater in our own operations. We've been able to grow the water that we beneficially reuse internally year over year by internalizing some of the pre-treated water, reducing the need to use freshwater at our TTFs. We anticipate further growth of water reuse to reduce cost and environmental burden of our operations.

(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 privately held company, we will not be providing financial figures in this report. Additionally, we are already engaged in expanding our services and applications.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our growth in commercial/industrial wastewater treatment options are helping both our customers and our own facilities to reduce our environmental footprint with regard to water consumption and disposal. Additionally, as part of our sustainability-linked financing terms, we have committed to grow both the waste that we process sustainably (SLF KPI 1) by 2.5%, and wastes we recycle and reuse (SLF KPI 2) by 25% relative to a 2020 baseline by 2025.

[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)

0

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

Select from:

☒ 21-30%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Our reuse and recycling service offerings continue to take a larger share of our overall service offering portfolio every year. Revenues from our expanded services and sales continue to grow company profitability while diversifying our options for our customers.

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)

0

(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

While we have doubled our water treatment capacity, water-treatment is a relatively small part of our business in terms of revenue.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☒ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☒ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☒ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☒ Yes, but it is not publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

Policy covers board diversity, and sets targets by year for overall diversity by gender and race combined.

[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: ☒ Yes
Water	Select from: ☒ Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: ☒ 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

- ☒ Director on board
- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
- ☒ 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 the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- ☒ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Quarterly, the Chief Sustainability Officer reviews pertinent aspects of the sustainability program with the Environmental Justice and Sustainability Committee, including climate change and GHG emissions. This regular interaction is important to ensure recognition of potential risks and opportunities regarding climate change. In addition, climate change and policy are identified as a risk in our risk matrix, which is reviewed semi-annually with our risk management committee.

Water

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
- ☒ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

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

Select from:

- ☒ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
☒ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Water related issues are not common or material for review with the board. The Chief Sustainability Officer would be responsible for raising any such compliance issues with the board as needed.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
☒ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

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

Select from:

- ☒ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Biodiversity related issues are not common or material for review with the board. The Chief Sustainability Officer would be responsible for raising any such issues with the board as needed.

[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

- ☒ 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
- ☒ Experience in the environmental department of a government (national or local)

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: ☒ Yes
Water	Select from: ☒ Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

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

Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers 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

Quarterly, the Chief Sustainability Officer reviews pertinent aspects of the sustainability program with the Environmental Justice and Sustainability Committee, including climate change and GHG emissions. This regular interaction is important to ensure recognition of potential risks and opportunities regarding climate change. In addition, climate change and policy are identified as a risk in our risk matrix, which is reviewed semi-annually with our risk management committee.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

(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:

☒ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Water related issues are not common or material for review with the board. The Chief Sustainability Officer would be responsible for raising any such compliance issues with the board as needed.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(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:

☒ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Biodiversity related issues are not common or material for review with the board. The Chief Sustainability Officer would be responsible for raising any such compliance issues with the board as needed.

[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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Board members and C-suite executives each have fixed compensation and variable pay associated with company performance. While the variable pay is not directly tied to an environmental KPI, the success of the company as a sustainable waste management provider relies on our overall environmental performance. One such example is our position in the market as a GHG mitigating waste management provider. By diverting waste from landfills and finding alternative ways to reduce, reuse, recycle and recover waste, we reduce GHG emissions economy-wide. By capitalizing on this benefit in the marketplace, our company performance will improve.

Water

(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

100

(4.5.3) Please explain

Board members and C-suite executives each have fixed compensation and variable pay associated with company performance. While the variable pay is not directly tied to an environmental KPI, the success of the company as a sustainable waste management provider relies on our overall environmental performance. One such example is our progress against our Sustainability Linked Financing KPIs. We've committed to growing the waste that we process sustainably and recycle/ reuse by 2.5% and 25%, respectively, relative to a 2020 adjusted baseline. Should we fail to meet these targets in 2025, we will face financial penalties that may impact company performance and thus leadership. The water that we recycle and reuse for our customers impacts our progress towards these KPIs.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☒ Environment/Sustainability manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☒ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

Resource use and efficiency

☒ Improvements in emissions data, reporting, and third-party verification

Engagement

☒ Increased value chain visibility (traceability, mapping)

☒ Implementation of employee awareness campaign or training program on environmental issues

☒ Other engagement-related metrics, please specify :Internal training, supporting community outreach

(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

The company has assigned specific personnel to manage the company's progress and status regarding climate change and each of those individuals receives an annual bonus based on individual performance wherein their success in climate change would be among the factors considered.

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

Specific individuals in the company are tasked with implementation of initiatives that, among other benefits, result in net GHG emissions reductions. These employees are evaluated on their individual performance on these initiatives, among other responsibilities.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☒ Other senior-mid manager, please specify :Regional Environmental Directors

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Pollution

☒ Reduction of water pollution incidents

(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

The company has assigned a lead Environmental Directors in each of our three regions to support Area Environmental Managers and Facility Environmental Specialists. These environmental compliance personnel are tasked with driving environmental excellence at each of our sites. The most commonly tracked indicator

is EDEs, excess discharge events, inclusive of water events. The goal is always zero. A manager's ability to drive reductions is a reflection of performance and affects their year-end bonus payout. Similarly, their ability to drive water reductions and support water reuse projects is reflective of environmental excellence.

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

Specific individuals in the company are tasked with implementation of initiatives that, among other benefits, result in reduced water use, increased water recycling and eliminated water pollution events. These employees are evaluated on their individual performance on these initiatives, among other responsibilities.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

- Select all that apply
- ☒ Climate change
 - ☒ Water

(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

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our Environmental Policy is displayed in every facility to remind our teams that environmental excellence, like safety and operational excellence, is the responsibility of every employee. We are committed to delivering safe and reliable sustainable waste management services to our customers. By going beyond compliance, we help mitigate risk for ourselves and our trusted customers. Our business and services are a key part of a functioning circular economy and we must continue to make management decisions to move customer waste up the hierarchy.

(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 Net Positive Gain

(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 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

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

	Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?
	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[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?

	External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment	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 all that apply ☒ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to have one in the next two years

[Fixed row]

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

Federal Tax Policy

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Financial mechanisms (e.g., taxes, subsidies, etc.)

☒ Subsidies for low-carbon, non-renewable energy projects

☒ Subsidies for renewable energy projects

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☒ National

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☒ Support with no exceptions

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

☒ Regular meetings

- ☒ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers
- ☒ Responding to consultations

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

Investment and production tax credits included as part of the federal tax laws for 2025 were updated by the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA), signed into law on July 4, 2025. The bill includes tax benefits for the production of electricity from renewable resources with a GHG intensity of zero or less, viewed on a lifecycle basis. These tax incentives will help us deliver GHG reduction projects in our communities. Our engagement has been focused on ensuring that carbon intensity calculations are accurate and based on the latest science. We will evaluate our engagement based on the inclusion of recent data and science in the final calculation approaches and technology selection.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

- ☒ No, we have not evaluated

Row 2

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

NY Climate Leadership & Community Protection Act (CLCPA)

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Social issues

- ☒ Public health

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

- ☒ Sub-national

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

- ☒ United States of America

(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

- ☒ Support with minor exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

Any cap & trade program should be established equitably across the waste sector on the basis of lifecycle GHG emissions, to ensure that financial signals are properly aligned with GHG outcomes.

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

- ☒ Regular meetings
- ☒ Ad-hoc meetings
- ☒ Discussion in public forums
- ☒ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers
- ☒ Responding to consultations

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

As part of its Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act, NY State is developing a potential cap and trade program, which could include facilities that we operate in NY State. To the extent that the cap & trade program does not appropriately quantify emissions from waste-to-energy facilities and landfills, it could put our

facilities at a market disadvantage to landfills, even as waste-to-energy facilities help reduce GHG emissions relative to the business as usual practice of landfilling. Our engagement is focused on ensuring accurate quantification and alignment of the economic signal with the timing of waste management decisions. A successful engagement will see an equitable carbon price signal across the waste management industry timed for when decisions are made about the fate of wastes generated in the state.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☒ No, we have not evaluated

[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 voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

☒ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Dependencies & Impacts

☒ Risks & Opportunities

☒ Strategy

☒ Emissions figures

☒ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

We Help You Waste Better (p9-18), Wastewater Solutions (p17), Decarbonizing Society By Reimagining Waste (p21), Various environmental performance metrics (p33)

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Reworld-Sustainability-Report(2).pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

A more detailed 2024 Databook is underway with more data points against various reporting indices.

[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:

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

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Reworld found that with improved waste reduction efforts, increased recycling (especially organics recycling), and a shift from landfilling to WTE, the waste sector has the potential to cut U.S. net GHG emissions by upwards of 700 million metric tons of CO₂ per year by 2050. That's on par with shuttering 90 percent of coal plants or removing three-quarters of gasoline vehicles from U.S. roads. The analyses, however, did not relate those emissions reductions to a specific scenario, such as the 1.5°C or lower scenario referenced by CDP. We believe scenario analysis could be a very useful exercise to help demonstrate how more sustainable waste management, including the use of WTE for the materials remaining after recycling, could help meet climate change objectives, as well as better inform our short- and long-term business strategy. At this time, it is not a strategic priority.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

We focus on practical water stewardship rather than scenario analysis. Through centralized wastewater treatment, we pretreat customer wastewater and discharge it directly to publicly owned treatment works (POTWs). We also reuse treated water in our own operations. Many sites have zero process-water discharge, and we routinely monitor discharges for compliance. While these programs help manage water risks and support circular use, we do not have an official water-related scenario analysis and do not plan to do so in the next two years. At this time, it is not a strategic priority.

[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:

☒ No

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

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Our operations use very little fossil fuel, from a scope 1 perspective. Fossil auxiliary fuels are used as required to run equipment and maintain combustion in our TTF operations. Our transition plan is hinged on the diversion of waste from landfills which is a very difficult technology to mitigate in a silo. Landfill methane emissions largely uncontrolled, even with landfill gas collection systems in place. Recent studies using aircraft and satellite measurement have shown that landfill emissions are on average 2-3 times greater than what was modeled/reported to regulating agencies. As such, the focus of our transition is on avoiding landfill methane emissions.

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

Select from:

☒ Not applicable as our organization does not have shareholders

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

N/A

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

The plan relies on sector-wide participation to drive circular habits and move waste up the hierarchy, away from landfilling. By reducing per capita waste generation to more closely reflect rates in Europe, significantly increasing recycling, and relying on TTFs for managing residuals, the U.S. could save 700 million metric tons of GHGs annually, relative to current waste management practices. Policies will be required to drive consumer behavior, incentivize product stewardship programs, and intentionally and effectively divert organics from landfills. This plan is aggressive but not impossible as we have seen our European counterparts achieve similar and better waste management practices through public policy and landfill taxes. Our calculations have considered the time it will take for this transition to occur and how the energy landscape and waste composition could change.

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

Reworld continues to offer the essential waste management service of waste to energy through our TTFs, to manage residues remaining after residential and commercial recycling efforts. TTFs are an important element of a sustainable waste management program and supports the growth of recycling. Additionally, Reworld is committed to moving the waste that we manage up the hierarchy for our customers, to model the importance of resource reuse. Over the last 5 years our business model has shifted significantly with recycling and reuse revenues growing as a share of overall revenue.

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

Reworld-Sustainability-Report(2).pdf

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

Select all that apply

☒ Plastics

☒ Water

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

*Recycling and Reuse is a key part of this transition plan, inclusive of returning plastic and water to the economy via recycling and reuse.
[Fixed row]*

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☒ Products and services

☒ Upstream/downstream value chain

☒ Investment in R&D

☒ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

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

Providing sustainable waste, materials, and energy services to our customers is the cornerstone of our business. Each of our service offerings responds to customer demand for sustainable waste management services that are superior to landfilling according to the "waste hierarchy" and assists our customers in meeting their own zero-waste, zero-waste-to-landfill, circular economy, and other sustainability goals. These goals, and the waste management hierarchy itself, are designed to reduce the environmental impacts of waste management, including the emission of GHGs. Each of our service offerings is focused on providing cost effective and sustainable solutions that leverage our extensive network of WTE and Materials Processing facilities (MPFs), and transfer stations in North America. Alternative Fuel processing is a recent area of growth and opportunity for us, that is helping to decarbonize the cement industry, one of the most carbon intensive industries in the world. This fuel, made of non-recyclable waste materials, replaces coal in the cement manufacturing process while diverting waste from landfill. Our new acquisitions have catapulted our position in this growing market. As part of our sustainability-linked financing (SLF), we committed to increase both tons diverted from landfilling, and well as increase tons recycled and reused, both of which are inextricably linked with the services that we provide that help reduce societal GHG emissions relative to business as usual practices.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

Our primary business of energy recovery reduces the volume of waste by up to 90%. Recovering metals from the waste is an important part of our business and climate story. The production of metals from raw materials is very GHG-intensive. Further, finding more uses for the remaining inert ash is becoming increasingly more important. As society moves toward a carbon constrained economy, we expect that the value of metals and other recoverable materials in the residue will

increase. As such, we have invested heavily in equipment and technology to improve our metal recovery efficiency. In furtherance of that direction, we have been focusing on our ash. We launched our pilot Total Ash Processing System (TAPS) in 2021 and operated for over a year. This system, located in Fairless Hills, Pennsylvania, adjacent to our metals processing facility, separated the combined ash from WTE facilities into its component parts enabling increased recycling of small metal fractions and recovery of aggregate for reuse as construction material. We have also submitted a Beneficial Use Determination (BUD) application to develop reuse outlets for aggregate recovered from WTE ash in New York. We are in the preliminary stages of developing a similar application in Hawaii. Like the TAPS project, these would enable the recovery of aggregate for reuse as construction material while further reducing the volume of residue requiring disposal. Recovery of additional metal for recycling helps reduce GHG emissions associated with production of metals from raw materials. The diversion of residue from landfilling also helps reduce the GHG impacts associated with transportation and the placement of residue in the landfill.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

We have recently partnered with several university research teams in their proposals to secure funding through the U.S. Department of Energy's Advanced Research Program Agency – Energy (ARPA-e) to pursue advanced metal recovery and ash beneficial use. These technologies, if successful, will help recover additional metal for recycling, including precious and rare earth elements, resulting in further lifecycle GHG emissions reductions from materials management. Furthermore, use of ash as a potential cement replacement or admixture can help with cement decarbonization.

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

We have, at several of our sites, implemented capital projects designed to harden critical infrastructure against flooding that is potentially exasperated by sea-level rise and/or the increased frequency of storm events. We have also made capital investments to help improve the ability of certain facilities to operate during periods of local grid outages. We anticipate that climate change could lead to increased intensity and duration of storm events that could make power disruptions more likely. While extreme weather events can pose risks to our operations, we are also preparing for such events, demonstrating a potential opportunity as a reliable partner in essential waste management.

[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

- ☒ Assets
- ☒ Revenues
- ☒ Access to capital
- ☒ Capital allocation
- ☒ Capital expenditures
- ☒ Acquisitions and divestments

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Our company's mission is to provide more sustainable waste management services. Increasingly, sustainable waste management is inextricably linked to reducing GHG emissions. As such, climate-related risks, and to an even greater extent, opportunities, have been a key factor in capital allocation, revenues, capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures, and assets. Most importantly, our decision to pursue sustainably-linked financing (SLF) is a direct reflection of the role that we see climate playing in financial planning. As the first leveraged buyout (LBO) completed with SLF, EQT's acquisition of Reworld (then Covanta) capitalized on the greenhouse gas mitigating aspects of our business, as well as the further GHG emissions reductions that could be achieved through growth in the business, specifically in tons diverted from landfilling through energy recovery, recycling, and other sustainable materials management services. We believe that such an approach provided as additional opportunities in the market to find attractive financing. A large part of our strategy to meet SLF targets and expand our service offerings to customers relies on mergers and acquisitions. As of June 2023, Reworld has acquired 8 new businesses, expanding offerings in wastewater treatment, alternative fuels, transportation, and waste-to-product operations. For example, our alternative fuels business provides low carbon fuels to the cement industry, helping to decarbonize this very emissions intensive sector. In addition to expanding our service offerings, these acquisitions have expanded our footprint in North America, granting access to markets in new regions. The addition of these services to our existing portfolio of environmentally sustainable solutions enables the company to significantly expand its carbon neutral capabilities for customers while simultaneously optimizing existing assets such as our Waste-to-energy and Material Processing operations.

[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: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ 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 :Sector-based emissions reductions

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Revenue/Turnover

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

0

(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

We are not providing a revenue figure, however, 100% of our revenue is aligned with our organization's climate transition plan, which is to reduce the climate impacts of waste management by moving materials up the waste management hierarchy for our clients. All revenue from waste management services (60%) is therefore aligned with this transition plan. We also generate revenue from sold electricity. Under both federal and state programs, including state-level renewable portfolio standards, the entirety of our electrical output is considered renewable. We plan to continue growing our sustainable waste management service offerings, and therefore plan to maintain 100% alignment between our revenue and climate transition plan.

[Add row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Carbon

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon.

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

☒ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☒ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

☒ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

☒ Navigate regulations

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☒ Social cost of climate-related impact

(5.10.1.4) Calculation methodology and assumptions made in determining the price

We use the U.S. Federal Government's Social Cost of Carbon (2021) to demonstrate and communicate the economic benefits of landfill diversion and energy from waste with policy and decision makers.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☒ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☒ Static

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

23.93

(5.10.1.11) Maximum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

71.43

(5.10.1.12) Business decision-making processes the internal price is applied to

Select all that apply

- ☒ Impact management
- ☒ Product and R&D
- ☒ Risk management
- ☒ Opportunity management
- ☒ Public policy engagement

(5.10.1.13) Internal price is mandatory within business decision-making processes

Select from:

- ☒ No

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

100

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

We use a static, uniform price. The 2021 Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 13990, authored by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government discloses ranges of social cost of carbon for CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O. We use the 2020 range of \$670 - \$2000 / metric ton of CH₄ from this technical document to demonstrate the benefits of landfill methane avoidance from TTFs.

[Add row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change
Customers	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change ☒ Water ☒ Plastics
Investors and shareholders	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change
Other value chain stakeholders	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change

[Fixed row]

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

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	Select from: ☒ No, we do not assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, and have no plans to do so within two years

[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

☒ Procurement spend

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

The Strategic Sourcing group is driving the Sustainable Partner Program (SPP) focused on the sale of voluntary Renewable Energy Credits. We are launching the program with a selection of our own suppliers. One of the selection criteria was procurement spend.

[Fixed row]

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

	Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process	Comment
Climate change	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years	<i>The SPP is a voluntary program rolled out to our trusted suppliers as part of a mutual support of each others climate goals.</i>

[Fixed 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:

- ☒ Carbon removals

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

- ☒ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions
- ☒ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact
- ☒ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Innovation and collaboration

- ☒ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(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:

- ☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

- ☒ 1-25%

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

The Strategic Sourcing group is driving the Sustainable Partner Program (SPP) focused on the sale of voluntary Renewable Energy Credits. We are launching the program with a selection of our own key suppliers to support the reduction of their own carbon footprint.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

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

☒ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ None

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

Many of our customers have an interest in the GHG emissions from their downstream waste management. Therefore, we make available to all of our customers information on climate change related to more sustainable waste management. The exact nature of the engagement varies depending on the client and can range from 1. assistance with lifecycle inventories and analysis, 2. development of GHG emissions savings metrics associated with operating milestones, 3. assistance with Scope 3 inventory development, 4. participation in employee and public meetings and hearings, 5. development of facility-specific websites to better educate the public (municipal customers) on the GHG and other environmental impacts of WTE, and 6. dissemination of technical information on climate change through our sustainability report, facility performance sheets, website, and white papers

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

A clear measure of success is continued business. We also know we've made an impact when we're featured in a sustainability report or media post describing the positive outcomes of working together. We want to build lasting relationships with our customers through our sustainable offerings.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Customers

(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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

We manage wastewater for many of our clients, with options to reuse, recycle or otherwise dispose of it. Teaching our customers about each of these options puts the choice in their hands to move it up the hierarchy towards reuse, if the waste is eligible. We will provide education on these options as they arise, especially if a waste is eligible for more than one time of treatment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

A clear measure of success is if a customer chooses to understand more about their disposal options and each of their environmental benefits. Waste management isn't just about dealing with unwanted material, we hope our customers have pride in doing the right thing.

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

☒ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☒ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ None

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

As a sustainable waste management company, our current and potential investors want to understand more about the GHG benefits of our services. We respond, in great detail, to inquiries as they are requested.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

ESG performance is important to many investors. Continued engagement / investing is a measure of success.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Employees

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☒ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ None

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

All of our employees contribute to the sustainability of our company. It is important they understand their impact and the impact of the overall company. Our GHG benefits are an important part of our service offering. Our Sustainability Employee Resource Group (ERG) runs campaigns, virtual panels and challenges to engage employees around the topics of sustainability. Additionally, all employees are onboarded with an introduction to our sustainability mission.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Employee participation in ERG events is voluntary

[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Other, please specify :We have not received any	<i>We have not received any "mutually beneficial environmental initiative" requests due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement.</i>

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Equity share

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

Historically we have responded to the CDP questionnaire on an equity share basis. We will continue to do so.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Our water related data is most readily available on an operational control basis. Since this is our first time reporting on this topic, we will use the most accessible data.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Our plastic related data is most readily available on an operational control basis. Since this is our first time reporting on this topic, we will use the most accessible data.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Our biodiversity related data is most readily available on an operational control basis. Since this is our first time reporting on this topic, we will use the most accessible data.

[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: EnviroVac Waste Transport Systems

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

EnviroVac Waste Transport Systems was acquired in Q4 of 2024. In addition to the acquisition, 5 new Material Processing Facilities (MPFs) were added to the Reworld fleet in 2024.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[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:

☒ No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold

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

We do not have a baseline recalculation policy. We do not measure our emissions against the base year and do not deem it a worthwhile exercise. Additionally, the emissions from our acquired facilities contribute very minimally to our inventory, less than 1% of total scope 1 emissions.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard
- ☒ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Indirect Emissions From Purchased Electricity
- ☒ US EPA Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule
- ☒ US EPA Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)

(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 have operations where we are able to access electricity supplier emission factors or residual emissions factors, but are unable to report a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

Reworld TTFs generate electricity for export to the grid. However, these sites do, on occasion, purchase electricity from the grid to sustain operations during maintenance outages or for other purposes. Additionally, our MPFs, transfer stations and offices purchase electricity for their operations. As an enterprise, our 2023 purchased electricity was equivalent to less than 1% of our total gross electrical generation. For the location-based figure, we report using the average grid factors from U.S. EPA's eGRID tool which are a data-based set of emission factors for individual power control regions in the U.S. We are able to access public electricity supplier emissions factors in order to calculate the market-based figure, however, we do not have renewable contracts from our suppliers, as required by the CDP. We do not actively source renewable electricity because it is supplemental to our generation, making up less than a percent of our total gross generation. Finally, Reworld tracks purchased electricity closely to offset all Scope 2 emissions at year-end. 100% of purchased electricity are offset using RECs generated at our own TTF.

[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

Regional Offices

(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)

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☒ Emissions are not relevant

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

Select from:

☒ Emissions are not relevant

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

Select from:

☒ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

An assessment of our former Morristown corporate office (vacated in 2025), our largest office, found total Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions to be approximately 0.01% of our total Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Many of our remaining office locations are co-located with our operating facilities, where their GHG emissions are counted in the existing inventory as part of our operating facilities. Among these co-located office, many would be excluded from the calculation approach because they are not owned but rather leased. Lastly, our two other offices NOT co-located at any TTF are significantly smaller than our Morristown office.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

Our former Morristown headquarters (vacated in 2025), the largest of the regional offices, uses about 1% of enterprise-wide purchased electricity. This translates to 0.01% of total S1 and S2 emissions, on an equity share basis. There are about 4 other, much smaller, regional offices across North America. Conservatively, if they all used the same electricity as the Morristown office, offices would represent 0.05% of total S1 & S2 emissions. There are further considerations about each of their equity share status that would exclude them from the boundary.

Row 2

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

HFCs and PFCs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☒ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

A detailed review of facility-level GHG emissions completed in 2008 estimated emissions of HFCs and PFCs, predominately from the servicing of air conditioning equipment, to represent approximately 0.01% of our total Scope 1 GHG inventory. No changes have occurred to our existing operations since 2008 that would fundamentally change the magnitude of the expected emissions of HFCs and PFCs. A formal review of the potential emissions from our recently acquired businesses have not been conducted. However, these sites are much smaller than those initially assessed.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

A detailed review, surveying the air conditioning equipment at our sites, revealed that potential HFC and PFC emissions, on a CO2e basis are de minimis. In the last 2 years we have acquired 8 new businesses. If we were to double or even triple the air conditioning equipment in our operating boundary, potential emissions would still be less than 1% of total S1 and S2 emissions.

Row 3

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Transfer Stations

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

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☒ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

A detailed assessment of GHG emissions performed in several states as part of our earlier participation in The Climate Registry found that transfer station Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions represented 0.02% of total Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions. Exclusion of transfer station emissions is not expected to have a material impact on the inventory. Despite these findings, the scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity (0.02% of total purchased electricity) at these sites have been included due to data availability.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

We performed a detailed GHG assessment of our transfer stations in order to determine its relevance to our inventory. The results indicated they represent 0.02%. Further, our Energy team tracks monthly electricity invoices at all our operating sites. The associated scope 2 emissions have been calculated for the transfer stations and included in our inventory.

Row 4

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Mobile equipment at TTFs, fire pumps at TTFs, and other de minimis sources across the fleet

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

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☒ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

These assets at our TTFs and other facilities are de minimis sources of emissions at the facility level, let alone on a company-wide scale.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

A review of these assets, as well as estimations based on the prevalence of these assets company-wide, as well as the estimated associated emissions of these assets, yields an emissions total that is not significant enough to be included in our emissions inventory.

[Add row]

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3951676

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are based on the combustion of the fossil fraction of waste, on-site fossil fuel combustion, and any owned-fleet fuel use.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33497

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For the location-based figure, we report using the average grid factors from U.S. EPA's eGRID tool which are a data-based set of emission factors for individual power control regions in the U.S.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

124861

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We base our emissions estimates on actual quantities of materials used in the reporting year, or, if this data is not available, purchasing records. Calculation based on consumption of relevant raw materials, including lime, carbon, limestone, urea, ammonia, steel, and Inconel metal and published emission factor data. Emissions factors and sources: Lime= 0.768 ton CO₂ / ton lime (source: NREL LCA Database) Carbon = 0.13 ton CO₂ / ton GAC (source: CH2MHill Life Cycle Assessment of Greenhouse Gases for the Product: Amended Silicates) Limestone= 0.103 ton CO₂ / ton limestone (source: University of TN Center for Clean Products (2008) Limestone Quarrying and Processing: A Life-Cycle Inventory) Urea= 0.002 ton CO₂ / gal. urea (source: Kool et al (2012) GHG Emissions of N, P and K fertilizer production, Table 13) Ammonia= 2.56 ton CO₂ / ton NH₃ (source: Kool et al (2012) GHG Emissions of N, P and K fertilizer production, Table 13) Steel= 1.82 ton CO₂ / ton steel tubing (source: ATHENA 2002) Inconel (average) = 5.86 ton CO₂/ton Inconel (source: avg based on Inconel 600, 625, 718 emissions factors from SpecialMetals.com)

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2011

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This S3 category was not historically calculated.

[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)

4202588

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are based on the combustion of the fossil fraction of waste, on-site fossil fuel combustion, any owned-fleet fuel use, and identified SF6 leakage.
[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)

14501

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Reworld generates electricity for export to the grid. However, we do, on occasion, purchase electricity from the grid to sustain operations during maintenance outages or for other purposes. Our 2024 purchased electricity was equivalent to less than 1% of our total gross electrical generation. For the location-based figure, we report using the average grid factors from U.S. EPA's eGRID tool which are a data-based set of emission factors for individual power control regions in the U.S. We are able to access public electricity supplier emissions factors in order to calculate the market-based figure, however, we do not have renewable contracts from our suppliers, as required by the CDP. We do not actively source renewable electricity because it is supplemental to our generation, making up less than a percent of our total gross generation.
[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)

102243

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We base our emissions estimates on actual quantities of materials used in the reporting year, or, if this data is not available, purchasing records. Calculation based on consumption of relevant raw materials, including lime, carbon, limestone, urea, ammonia, steel, and Inconel metal and published emission factor data. Emissions factors and sources: Lime 0.768 ton CO2 / ton lime (source: NREL LCA Database) Carbon 0.13 ton CO2 / ton GAC (source: CH2MHill Life Cycle Assessment of Greenhouse Gases for the Product: Amended Silicates) Limestone 0.103 ton CO2 / ton limestone (source: University of TN Center for Clean Products (2008) Limestone Quarrying and Processing: A Life-Cycle Inventory) Urea 0.002 ton CO2 / gal. urea (source: Kool et al (2012) GHG Emissions of N, P and K fertilizer production, Table 13) Ammonia 2.56 ton CO2 / ton NH3 (source: Kool et al (2012) GHG Emissions of N, P and K fertilizer production, Table 13) Steel 1.82 ton CO2 / 106 ton steel tubing (source: ATHENA 2002) Inconel (average) 5.86 ton CO2/ton Inconel (source: avg based on Inconel 600, 625, 718 emissions factors from SpecialMetals.com)

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We estimate our emissions from capital goods based on emissions factors from peer reviewed studies. The scope 3 emissions from capital goods have been found to represent a minor portion of total facility emissions. One study determined that about 7-14 kg CO₂e per tonne of waste combusted over a facility's lifetime is associated with capital goods. (See L.K. Brogaard, C. Riber, T.H. Christensen. Quantifying capital goods for waste incineration, International Journal of Integrated Waste Management, Science and Technology, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956053X13001232>)

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

35662

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average product method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We estimate our emissions from upstream fuel related activities based on emissions factors used by the US EPA. Calculation based on upstream emissions from propane, diesel, and natural gas. Emissions factors are based on industry averages, pulled from the following sources: Propane 0.05 ton CO₂e / MWh (source: GTI (2017) GHG and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Analysis) Natural Gas 0.05 ton CO₂e / MWh (source: GTI (2017) GHG and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Analysis) Diesel 0.07 ton CO₂e / MWh (source: U.S. EPA (2020) Summary Lifecycle Analysis Greenhouse Gas Results for the U.S. Renewable Fuels Standard Program Version 1.1)

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

59732

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

☒ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

In most cases, we do not have operational control over waste haulers who deliver MSW to our facility. In general, transportation is contracted by the waste generator. The resulting Scope 3 CO2e emissions represent about 30% of our Scope 3 emissions, but less than 2% of the total emissions (Scope 1, 2, and 3) Calculation based on tons of waste processed (equity-share basis), average truck capacity of 13 tons, average transportation distance of 50 miles, and average emissions factor of 1.47 kg CO2e / vehicle-mile

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Our business is to manage waste sustainably for our customers, largely via landfill diversion. Our TTFs generate an inert ash that is either beneficially used, placed in MSW landfills, or placed in ash monofills. Long term testing of leachate from an ash disposal facility in Marion County, Oregon revealed no detectable concentrations of semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs). (See Roffman, Haia K. Municipal Waste Combustion Ash Landfill Leachate Quality – Long Term Monitoring. Presented

at the Air & Waste Management Association 90th Annual Meeting & Exhibition, June 8-13, 1997, Toronto, Canada) The absence of SVOCs supports the premise that minimal biological degradation of carbon, and subsequent evolution of methane, occurs with ash in landfills. Furthermore, ash was observed to solidify significantly in the monofill, likely rendering any remaining carbon in the ash unavailable to biological processes. Recent research has also identified municipal waste combustor ash as a slight GHG sink. (See Rendek, E., G. Ducom, P. Germain, Carbon dioxide sequestration in municipal solid waste incinerator (MSWI) bottom ash, Journal of Hazardous Materials, 128: 1, 73-79. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2005.07.033)

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, calculated

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

2685

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Supplier-specific method

☒ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions estimate provided by travel agency vendors for air, rental cars, and hotels at year-end.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, calculated

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

12346

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

☒ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 CO2e emissions calculated from employee commuting are considered irrelevant. In 2024, approximately 15% of our workforce worked on a hybrid schedule (3 out of 5 days in office) as a result of increased workplace flexibility. On average our employees live 30 miles away from their place of work. An emissions factor of 3.98×10^{-4} metric tons CO2e/mile is based on the EPA GHG calculator for passenger vehicles. Note that this is a conservative estimate which includes all Reworld employees, not calculated on an equity share-site basis.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld does not have any appreciable upstream leased assets.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, calculated

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

5946

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

☒ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld TTF's primary products / outputs are energy products in the form of steam and electricity. Any downstream losses associated with delivery of these products are already included in our scope 1 emissions. After the combustion process, approximately 10% of the initial volume of wastes processed remains as an inert ash which must be managed, either in a regular MSW landfill, as landfill daily cover, or in an ash monofill. These applications are typically located off-site. The scope 3 emissions associated with the ash transportation is based on tons of ash processed, typical ash truck capacity of 20 tons, average transportation distance of 35 miles, and average emissions factor of 1.47 kg CO2e / vehicle-mile.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld TTF's sold products include electricity, steam and metals recovered for recycling. Steam and electricity are not subject to further processing, therefore, there are no emissions from processing of these products. Metals recovered for recycling generate GHGs during the recycling process; however, per the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, emissions from the processing of recycled inputs are allocated to the company that uses the recycled material.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld TTF's primary products are electricity, steam, and metals for recycling. The use of electricity and steam downstream does not generate emissions, although the processes in which these products are used may have different sources of emissions. Similarly, the metals sold for recycling are not finished products. They will likely be incorporated into other products that could have emissions in the use phase; however, those emissions would be attributable to a downstream manufacturer.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld TTF's primary products steam and electricity, do not require end of life treatment. The recovery of metals for recycling is further processed and the end of life emissions associated with the final product into which the recovered metal is used is not attributable to Reworld.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld does not have any appreciable downstream leased assets.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld does not have franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Reworld does not have significant investments outside of equity investments in those facilities already included in our Scope 1 inventory.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have not evaluated upstream emissions outside of those already included in our Scope 3 calculations.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☒ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have not evaluated downstream emissions outside of those already included in our Scope 3 calculations.
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	Select from: ☒ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	Select from: ☒ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 3	Select from: ☒ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed 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)

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

Renewable energy consumption YOY has not changed; the biogenic C in waste as a percentage of total C in waste did not change materially year over year. We do not use other renewable energy sources at this time.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No other reduction activities to report.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No divestments in the reporting year.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No emissions were recorded in the reporting year from our acquisition, which was acquired toward the end of Q4 in 2024.

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

No mergers in the reporting year.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions*Select from:*☒ Decreased**(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)**

1.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Our TTFs experienced an overall YoY reduction in waste throughput, resulting in lower absolute Scope 1 CO2 emissions. Purchased electricity increased YoY, partially offsetting these reductions in Scope 2. Both impacts are reflected in the Scope 1 and 2 totals.

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

No changes in methodology in the reporting year.

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

No change in boundary.

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

284806

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

6.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The fossil carbon per ton of waste processed at our TTFs decreased in 2024, lowering overall emissions intensity. This reflects a change in the fraction of biogenic carbon of incoming waste. As we cannot control the composition of the waste we process, this variability is expected year to year.

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

No other changes to report.

Other

(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

No other changes to report.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

	CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)	Comment
	6959664	Biogenic CO2 emissions are derived from waste sources of biomass combusted at Reworld TTFs and are widely recognized as nearly carbon neutral.

[Fixed row]

(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)

4160616

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ N2O

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

37747

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ CH4

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

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
[\[Add row\]](#)

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

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Canada	545	117	23
United States of America	4202044	14385	17601

[\[Fixed row\]](#)

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

Select all that apply
☒ By activity

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

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>TTF (aka Waste to Energy)</i>	4144324
Row 2	<i>Material Processing Facilities</i>	19306
Row 3	<i>Natural Gas Steam Generation</i>	12936
Row 4	<i>Waste Transportation</i>	23909
Row 5	<i>Other</i>	2114

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By activity

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

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>TTF (aka Waste to Energy)</i>	7056
Row 2	<i>Material Processing Facilities</i>	6194
Row 3	<i>Transport</i>	416
Row 4	<i>Landfill</i>	2

[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)

4010144

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

14501

(7.22.4) Please explain

The defined "Consolidated accounting group" accounts for the entire Reworld enterprise. Any emissions exclusions have been explained in the scope 3 disclosures.

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

(7.22.4) Please explain

Reworld does not have "other entities"
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☒ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Stack emissions associated with the off-site combustion of waste with energy recovery and/or recycling are not counted in a generator's Scope 3 inventory in accordance with the WRI / WBCSD Scope 3 Standard. Furthermore, 0% of the client's waste was sent to landfill (indicated with 0 in "Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member"). This signifies the total diversion of this client's waste from landfill, translating to 0 metric tonnes of CO₂e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

We follow the WRI / WBCSD Scope 3 Standard. The assumption is that the customer is not landfilling waste through Reworld.

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

See p80 of WRI / WBCSD (2013) Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions (version 1.0) Supplement to the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting & Reporting Standard <https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-value-chain-scope-3-standard>

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☒ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Stack emissions associated with the off-site combustion of waste with energy recovery and/or recycling are not counted in a generator's Scope 3 inventory in accordance with the WRI / WBCSD Scope 3 Standard. Furthermore, 0% of the client's waste was sent to landfill (indicated with 0 in "Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member"). This signifies the total diversion of this client's waste from landfill, translating to 0 metric tonnes of CO₂e.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

We follow the WRI / WBCSD Scope 3 Standard. The assumption is that the customer is not landfilling waste through Reworld.

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

See p80 of WRI / WBCSD (2013) Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions (version 1.0) Supplement to the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting & Reporting Standard <https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-value-chain-scope-3-standard>
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☒ We face no challenges

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

By sending their waste to us to manage, instead of landfills, our customers no longer have a Scope 3 emission associated with waste disposed from operations. In accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Emissions Reporting Guidance, wastes that are recycled, composted, or sent for energy recovery do not result in a Scope 3 emission. Instead, any emissions associated with recycling, composting, or energy recovery are allocated to the new products generated, whether they be materials or energy. There are cases where we may send some of our customers' waste to landfills; however, that represents only about 3% of total waste disposition. Therefore, it is relatively straightforward to allocate emissions, since they are generally zero. However, the CDP questionnaire also asks for us to report on the activity amount, either in terms of the amount of product or value or products and services provided. We cannot provide this information, unless we have clear authorization to do so by the customer.

[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:

☒ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☒ Capabilities to allocate emissions to customers already maximized

(7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Our capabilities for emission allocation are already maximized through analysis of where our customers' waste streams are sent for final treatment.

[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: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: ☒ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: ☒ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: ☒ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: ☒ 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

16178798

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

16188648

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

32367446.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

44556

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

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

44556.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

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

0.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

16223354

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

16188648

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

32412002.00

[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: ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: ☒ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: ☒ Yes

[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:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

16178798

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

12875767

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

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

277489

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This represents the electricity derived from the biogenic portion of MSW at TTFs (aka WTE). Waste-to-energy has been recognized as renewable by the federal government for nearly thirty years under a variety of statutes, regulations, and policies. Many state have recognized as renewable under state statutes as well.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use biomass other than the biogenic content of our waste.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use renewables other than the biogenic content of our waste.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use coal.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

162984

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

108653

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

54331

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This represents the sum of diesel / fuel oil used.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

481331

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

185657

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

31892

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

263782

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This represents a sum of natural gas, gasoline and propane use.

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

15544335

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

12875767

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

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

2668568

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This represents the non-biogenic portion of energy generation from MSW.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

32367446

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

26571385

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

86221

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

5709840

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This represents all fuel on-site use.

[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)

5866723

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

841420

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

5866723

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

841420

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)

2403585

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

2328831

(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]

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

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1059

(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)

1059.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

43497

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

841420

(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)

884917.00

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

915

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

4217089

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ full time equivalent (FTE) employee

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

4400

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

3.6

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Acquisitions

☒ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

In 2024, we experienced lower emissions primarily due to less waste processed at our facilities.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☒ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

2.1

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tons CO2e avoided

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

metric ton MSW diverted from landfill

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.52.7) Please explain

This metric represents avoided emissions from diverting municipal solid waste from landfill to TTF. Each ton of MSW diverted avoids 2.1 metric tons of CO₂e, as verified by a 3rd party.

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ No target

(7.53.3) Explain why you did not have an emissions target, and forecast how your emissions will change over the next five years.

(7.53.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☒ Important but not an immediate business priority

(7.53.3.2) Five-year forecast

At this time, Scope 1 reductions would require the curtailing of the landfill diversion services that we offer. Our TTFs are a net source of GHG mitigation relative to the business-as-usual practice of landfilling, as recognized by many international organizations and protocols, including the EU, U.S. EPA, and CDM methodologies. However, WTE facilities also have stack emissions of CO₂ which can be subject to regulation if not viewed consistently against other forms of waste management (e.g. landfilling). Looking forward, we will continue to investigate the viability of carbon capture and additional low carbon waste management alternatives.

(7.53.3.3) Please explain

Reworld is a sustainable waste management company, providing economy-wide GHG mitigation through our landfill diversion services. In the last 2 years, we've focused on growing our footprint in order to offer more landfill diversion options to our customers. Our continued efforts to expand our services ultimately increase our own GHG emissions that cannot be mitigated at this time. Reducing our scope 1 emissions would entail delivering less landfill diversion services. As a result, we've focused on our two sustainability-linked financing targets to move waste up the hierarchy. Our 2025 targets are to grow the waste that we process sustainably and recycle / reuse by 2.5% and 25%, respectively, relative to a 2020 adjusted baseline. This results in economy-wide GHG reductions that cannot be accounted for within our operational boundary.

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ Targets to reduce methane emissions

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

11/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☒ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☒ Other waste management, please specify :Total wastes recycled or reused (short tons)

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

0

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

25

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

26.1

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

104.4000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Meeting this target helps us expand the low carbon waste management offerings we provide to our clients, both by expanded our service offerings to include wastewater treatment, waste depackaging, composting, and recycling, as well as recover additional metals from those wastes we receive for energy recovery. In general, recycling reduces GHG emissions relative to making new products from virgin materials and resources.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ Reduce short-lived climate pollutants

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Waste Recycled and Reused is defined as all residues from the WTE process that are recovered for recycling and all wastes managed by Reworld on behalf of our customers and clients through recycling and reuse in line with the waste management hierarchy of the U.S. EPA and the European Union. A description of how and why ReworldTM may adjust performance data is included in the Framework Document.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

The objective is to continue growing our impact as sustainable waste management providers via landfill diversion. We designed a more aggressive recycling / reuse target to place more emphasis on moving waste up the hierarchy.

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Building more recycling capabilities, networks and partnerships will be key in meeting these targets.

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

11/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☒ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☒ Other waste management, please specify :Total Sustainably Processed Waste (thousand short tons)

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

0

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

2.5

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

1

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

40.0000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Diverting wastes from landfills will help reduce overall country and region GHG emissions from the waste management sector, particularly methane.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ Reduce short-lived climate pollutants

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Sustainably Processed Waste is defined as all wastes managed by Reworld on behalf of our customers and clients through energy recovery (TTF), recycling, and reuse in line with the waste management hierarchy of the U.S. EPA and the European Union. A description of how and why ReworldTM may adjust performance data is included in the Framework Document.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

The objective is to continue growing our impact as sustainable waste management providers via landfill diversion.

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Maintaining current operations and executing on planned growth will be key to meeting these targets.

[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	0	Numeric input
To be implemented	2	575824
Implementation commenced	1	409272
Implemented	0	0
Not to be implemented	0	Numeric input

[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

Waste reduction and material circularity

☒ Other, please specify :Waste-to-energy facility expansion

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

544316

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(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)

0

(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

We will not be providing financial figures at this time.

[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:

☒ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We have embarked on a rigorous Continuous Improvement program aimed at making our operations more efficient. Many of the opportunities for optimizing efficiency also reduce lifecycle GHG emissions.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Many of the GHG emissions reductions opportunities that are within our control are aligned with financial signals. A greater return on metals recovery projects that results from higher separation efficiency also optimizes lifecycle GHG emissions reductions.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our Reworld Metals Management group was specifically created to identify and implement projects to recover additional metals from the ash remaining after the combustion process at our TTFs. These projects both create additional revenue for Reworld and generate lifecycle GHG emissions reductions as a result of the additional metal recovered for recycling. The use of recycled metal saves significant amounts of GHG emissions relative to using raw materials.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Internal finance mechanisms

(7.55.3.2) Comment

As a sustainable waste management company, we drive economy-wide GHG reductions by moving waste up the hierarchy for our clients. Our Sustainability Linked Financing KPI Targets, which were defined as part of the LBO of our company in 2021, link our landfill diversion progress to our financing. We have committed to (1) increase the waste that we recycle and reuse by 25% and (2) increase the waste that we process sustainably by 2.5%, relative to an adjusted 2020 baseline. This finance mechanism helps to drive our company-wide commitment to creatively find new landfill diversion outlets for our clients.

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☒ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Lifecycle methodology, USEPA MSW DST

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☒ Other, please specify :Sustainable Waste Management

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Our core business, operating TTFs (aka WTE, waste-to-energy), is widely recognized as a source of GHG mitigation. These facilities, and other like them around the world, are recognized internationally as a source of Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions mitigation and low carbon energy generation, including by the U.S. EPA; U.S. EPA scientists; the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ("IPCC"); the World Economic Forum; the European Union; CalRecycle; California Air Resources Board; and the Joint Institute for Strategic Energy Analysis (NREL). WTE facilities generate carbon offsets credits under both the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol and voluntary carbon offset markets. WTE was recognized as a compliance option for reducing GHG emissions from electricity generation in the final version of the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan promulgated in 2015. New TTFs were eligible to generate Emission Rate Credits (ERCs). Existing facilities were not a covered source and were considered a source of zero carbon energy under the program. Additionally, our growing AEF (Alternative Energy Fuel) business transforms non-recyclable industrial materials into low-carbon fuel for cement and lime kilns, supporting landfill diversion and cleaner energy generation by replacing fossil fuels with waste-derived alternative fuels.

(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 :Lifecycle assessment, ISO 14044

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☒ End-of-life stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Tons of MSW

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Landfill

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☒ End-of-life stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO₂e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

2.4

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

TTFs, which use WTE technology, contribute to the reduction of GHGs in the environment by: - generating energy that otherwise would likely be generated by fossil-fueled facilities; - diverting solid waste from landfills where it would have emitted methane for decades, even when factoring in landfill gas collection - recovering metals for recycling, saving the GHGs and energy associated with the production of products and materials from virgin inputs. On average, the U.S. EPA has determined that WTE facilities reduce GHG emissions by 1 ton of CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e) for every ton of municipal solid waste (MSW) diverted from landfill and processed. This is based on LCAs conducted over the 100-year horizon, which does not account for methane's potency in the short-term. The switch to the 20-year GWP highlights the importance of mitigating short lived climate pollutants to meet near-term climate targets.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

97

Row 3

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☒ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☒ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☒ Other, please specify :Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) procurement and retirement service via ReCredit

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Our renewable credit offering ReCredit is designed to help customers achieve net-zero goals through the purchase of sustainable carbon offsets, delivering Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) that directly benefit Scope 2 emission reduction efforts.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☒ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

1

[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☒ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☒ Carbon removal

(7.79.1.3) Project description

U.S. Forest Projects

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

5532

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☒ Compliance with a carbon pricing system

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2021

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☒ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☒ California Air Resources Board Compliance Offset Program

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☒ Standardized Approaches

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Buffer pool

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Activity-shifting

☒ Market leakage

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Some projects require and provide for direct environmental benefits in the state of California.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

n/a

Row 2

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☒ Coal mine/bed methane

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☒ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Mine methane capture projects

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

5532

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☒ Compliance with a carbon pricing system

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2023

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☒ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☒ California Air Resources Board Compliance Offset Program

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☒ Consideration of legal requirements

☒ Standardized Approaches

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Buffer pool

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Not assessed

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Regulatory compiiance

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

n/a

[Add row]

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:

☒ Specific groups, businesses, or organizations

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

At this time, we do not collect water intake/use at our MPFs or TFs. We capture annual intake at TTFs, only.

(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:

☒ Challenges associated with data collection and/or quality

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☒ 6-10%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

MPFs and TF operations are not as water intensive as TTF entities; their water use is deemed minimal. We have also been focused on improving data collection quality of other compliance / sustainability metrics and this has not been a priority.

[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:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility Bills (flowmeter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

Environmental specialists at TTFs aggregate water use bills at year end and report total figures to corporate. Utility bills are typically based on flow-meter data.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility Bills (flowmeter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

Environmental specialists at TTFs aggregate water use bills at year end and report total figures and sources to corporate. Utility bills are typically based on flow-meter.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawals are not tested for quality.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility Bills (flowmeter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

Environmental specialists at TTFs aggregate water discharge bills at year end and report total figures to corporate. Utility bills are typically based on flow-meter data.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility Bills (flowmeter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

Environmental specialists at TTFs aggregate water discharge bills and destination at year end and report total figures to corporate. Utility bills are typically based on flow-meter data.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility Bills (flowmeter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

This only applies to MPFs with pre-treatment capabilities to manage client wastewater. These "discharge" volumes are included under recycle / reuse rather than "discharge".

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water Quality Testing

(9.2.4) Please explain

MPFs must meet discharge permit limits.

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:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water Quality Testing

(9.2.4) Please explain

MPFs must meet discharge permit limits.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Temperature is not monitored.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Consumption is not monitored because total inbound / outbound is not known at all sites.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Zero Discharge TTFs may reuse internally generated wastewaters. This is not monitored by corporate.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

This is a minimum requirement for a safe and healthy workplace. It is not tracked.

(9.2.4) Please explain

This is a minimum requirement for a safe and healthy workplace. It is not tracked.

[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)

33474

(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:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water use is variable, especially at facilities that can use alternative water sources such as storm water retention or customer wastewaters. A facility's discharge could also significantly increase due to heavy storms. This variability is expected year over year.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

6582

(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:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water use is variable, especially at facilities that can use alternative water sources such as storm water retention or customer wastewaters. A facility's discharge could also significantly increase due to heavy storms. This variability is expected year over year.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

28686

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water use is variable, especially at facilities that can use alternative water sources such as storm water retention or customer wastewaters. A facility's discharge could also significantly increase due to heavy storms. This variability is expected year over year.

[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)

11007

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool*Select all that apply*☒ WRI Aqueduct**(9.2.4.9) Please explain***We don't foresee a significant change in our facilities operating efficiency regarding water withdrawal, nor do we foresee any major expansion or closure of facilities.
[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:*☒ Relevant**(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

21414

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year*Select from:*☒ Higher**(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year***Select from:*☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Usual variability based on water use/need

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2679

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :No difference

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

No change to water usage at these sites.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We didn't use water from this source in 2023/2024

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We didn't use water from this source in 2023/2024

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We didn't use water from this source in 2023/2024

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year*Select from:*☒ About the same**(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year***Select from:*☒ Other, please specify :Same as last year**(9.2.7.5) Please explain***No change to water usage at these sites.**[Fixed row]***(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.****Fresh surface water****(9.2.8.1) Relevance***Select from:*☒ Relevant**(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

207

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year*Select from:*☒ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

The decrease in water discharged to freshwater sources is driven by one facility. There is natural variability in water discharge, which can be impacted by weather events.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Not a relevant discharge location.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1162

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

There is natural variability in water discharge, which can be impacted by weather events.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

4264

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :No difference

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

No change to water discharge at these sites.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not offer tertiary treatment.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not offer secondary treatment.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year*Select from:*☒ About the same**(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year***Select from:*☒ Increase/decrease in business activity**(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to***Select from:*☒ 21-30**(9.2.9.6) Please explain***Usual level of variability based on amount of client wastewater received. Recycled wastewater is pre-treated at our MPFs before discharge to POTW.***Discharge to the natural environment without treatment****(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge***Select from:*☒ Relevant**(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)**

1369

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year*Select from:*

☒ Lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

There is natural variability in water discharge, which can be impacted by weather events.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3314

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 21-30

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

There is natural variability in water discharge, which can be impacted by weather events.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

We do not offer other treatment options.

[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.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

- ☒ Nitrates
- ☒ Phosphates
- ☒ Pesticides
- ☒ Priority substances listed under the EU Water Framework Directive

(9.2.10.3) List the specific substances included

n/a

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

These are not relevant to our business. We do not have non-incidental use of nitrates, phosphates or pesticides.
[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?

	Identification of facilities in the value chain stage	Please explain
Direct operations	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years	<i>While we recognize the water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities in our operations, we do not consider them substantive.</i>
Upstream value chain	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years	<i>While we recognize the water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities upstream of our operations, we do not consider them substantive.</i>

[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:

☒ No facilities were reported in 9.3.1

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	2700000000	80659.62	As a privately held company, we will not be sharing financial data.

[Fixed row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☒ No	We manage hazardous waste for our clients. Volumes are reported in public US EPA Toxic Release Inventory (TRI).

[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:

☒ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☒ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.14.4) Please explain

As a company we are focused on delivering GHG reductions through landfill diversion services. While TTFs are water intensive, many of our site are zero discharge facilities. Additionally, many of our sites are equipped to use alternative water sources such as client waste waters to reduce freshwater use. There are economic incentives to water reduction that will be realized with time.

[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.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Our MPFs are regulated by water discharge permits and are committed to Zero discharge events. There is no specific target with a start and end date for this goal.

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Water withdrawals are necessary for our operations. We are realizing opportunities to reduce freshwater use by using client wastewaters, particularly with our Massachusetts based acquisition which specializes in wastewater pre-treatment for reuse in industrial operations.

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Our employees have access to clean water at their places of work; we do not have targets around this area.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☒ Yes

[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 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Product water intensity

☒ Increase in water use met through recycling/reuse

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

11/01/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

100

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

250

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

250

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(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

Note: this target is a part of our Sustainability Linked Financing Targets described elsewhere in this report. The wastewater that we recycle / reuse for our clients help us meet our two waste related growth KPIs. There is NO prescribed growth for water treatment, however we have defined the target as 250 M gallons here in order to maintain the gains we've seen over the last few years. values presented here are measured in million gallons of water

(9.15.2.14) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Maintain operations as usual. Continue to pursue wastewater clients and find new uses in our operations.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

*Please see our Sustainability Linked Financing KPI Framework document here: <https://investors.reworldwaste.com/Sustainability-Linked-Financing>
[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: ☒ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	<i>Our company does not produce plastics, we manage them for our clients as needed. We do not have management targets for plastics specifically.</i>

[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

No applicable to our operations

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 to Reworld operations

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Material for operations and maintenance (e.g. shrink wrap for baling)

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Reworld does not produce or commercialize plastics

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Reworld does not produce or commercialize products wrapped in plastics

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Catered food for staff

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☒ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Not applicable to our operations

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 to our operations

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 management
- ☒ Education & awareness
- ☒ Other, please specify :Biodiversity risk screening (BRiSK) across all company sites

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Reworld has no facilities in this type of area.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Reworld has no facilities in this type of area.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Reworld has no facilities in this type of area.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Reworld has no facilities in this type of area.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Reworld has no facilities in this type of area.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

According to our Biodiversity Risk Screening (BRiSK), 5 Reworld facilities are likely to qualify as biodiversity sensitive locations due to their proximity to areas of biodiversity importance.

[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Wheeler National Wildlife Refuge

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We operate a TTF in Huntsville, AL.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

- ☒ Physical controls
☒ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

There is a potential for run-off or process water to affect nearby habitats, as assessed by BRiSK. This risk is mitigated internal reuse, routine monitoring, and environmental training.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

- ☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

- ☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Niagara River Corridor KBA

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

2

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We operate a TTF in Niagara, NY.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☒ Physical controls

☒ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

There is a potential for run-off or process water to affect nearby habitats, as assessed by BRiSK. This risk is mitigated internal reuse, routine monitoring, and environmental training.

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Niagara River Corridor KBA

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

2

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We operate an MPF in Niagara Falls, NY.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☒ Physical controls

☒ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

There is a potential for run-off or process water to affect nearby habitats, as assessed by BRiSK. This risk is mitigated internal reuse, routine monitoring, and environmental training.

Row 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Loxahatchee River and Slough KBA

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We operate a TTF in Palm Beach, FL.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☒ Physical controls

☒ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

There is a potential for run-off or process water to affect nearby habitats, as assessed by BRiSK. This risk is mitigated internal reuse, routine monitoring, and environmental training.

Row 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Canada

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Steckle Woods

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

0.5

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

We operate an MPF in Kitchener, ON, Canada.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☒ Physical controls

☒ Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

There is a potential for run-off or process water to affect nearby habitats, as assessed by BRISK. This risk is mitigated internal reuse, routine monitoring, and environmental training.

[Add 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: ☒ Third-party verification/assurance is currently in progress

[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
- ☒ Water
- ☒ Plastics

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Introduction

- ☒ Other data point in module 1, please specify :Sustainability Linked Financing: KPI 1 & 2

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

- ☒ Attestation Standards (AT-C Section 105 & 210/205) established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Our progress against our 2 sustainability linked financing KPI targets receive third-party limited assurance annually. We are currently in the process of verifying the 2024 progress that were disclosed in module 7 (Q 7.54). Attached is the 2023 completed document, which provides details on the reported KPIs.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Limited Assurance Report on 2023 Key Performance Indicators.pdf

Row 2

(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

Environmental performance – Climate change

- ☒ Product footprint

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

- ☒ Other climate change verification standard, please specify :ISO REFERENCED STANDARDS: ISO 14040:2006; ISO 14044:2006+Amd1:2017+Amd2:2020; ISO 14067:2018

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

The lifecycle GHG benefit of the diversion of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) from landfill to TTF has been externally verified by a third party. In the U.S., on average, 1 ton of MSW diverted from landfill to TTF results in 2.4 tons of CO2e savings. Attached is the verification document from our external verification figure. The full verification document is available on our external website, reworldwaste.com. ISO REFERENCED STANDARDS: ISO 14040:2006; ISO 14044:2006Amd1:2017Amd2:2020; ISO 14067:2018

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Reworld-ISO critical review 2024.09.20.pdf
[Add row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

VP of Environmental and Sustainability

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☒ Environment/Sustainability manager

[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:

☒ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute

