

Elanco ESG Data Table

ENVIRONMENTAL

Electricity and Carbon Management

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Scope 1 & 2				
Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (location-based calculation method)	180,901	134,469	135,102	Pending*
Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (location-based calculation method)	354,381	316,805	276,131	Pending*
Scope 1 and 2 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (location-based calculation method)	535,182	451,274	411,233	Pending*
Scope 1 and 2 emissions intensity (metric tons CO ₂ e/\$1 million revenue) (location-based calculation method)	112.3	94.7	86.3	Pending*
Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (market-based calculation method)	--	--	--	Pending*
Scope 1 and 2 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (market-based calculation method)	--	--	--	Pending*
Scope 1 and 2 emissions intensity (metric tons CO ₂ e /\$1 million revenue) (market-based calculation method)	--	--	--	Pending*
Scope 3 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e)	--	--	730,232	690,127
Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (location-based calculation method)	--	--		Pending*
Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e) (market-based calculation method)	--	--	--	Pending*
Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions intensity (metric tons CO ₂ e) (location-based calculation method)	--	--		Pending*
Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions intensity (metric tons CO ₂ e) (market-based calculation method)	--	--	--	Pending*
Total electricity consumption (megawatt-hours)	1,278,000	1,341,000	1,279,000	Pending*
Total electricity intensity (megawatt-hours/\$1 million revenue)	270	280	270	Pending*
Renewable electricity (megawatt-hours)	--	2,710	3,420	Pending*
Renewable electricity (% of total electricity consumption)	--	0.60%	0.86%	>12% (estimated)*

*Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and electricity metrics are expected to be complete in Q3 2023

Waste Management**

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total waste generated (metric tons)	104,142	91,384	90,430	108,282
Waste generated which is recycled (metric tons)	--	7,421	8,032	7,932
Waste generated which is reused (metric tons)	--	--	--	92,760
Total waste intensity (metric tons/\$1 million revenue)	21.86	19.18	18.98	24.20
Waste recycled intensity (metric tons/\$1 million revenue)	--	1.56	1.69	1.80
Hazardous waste (metric tons)	8,081	7,446	6,920	6,950
Hazardous waste incinerated (metric tons)	--	--	--	1,295
Hazardous waste landfilled (metric tons)	--	--	--	520
Hazardous waste other disposal method (metric tons)	--	--	--	112
Hazardous waste intensity (metric tons/\$1 million revenue)	1.7	1.56	1.45	1.58
Hazardous waste recycled (metric tons)	--	4,546	5,158	5,135
Hazardous waste recycled intensity (metric tons/\$1 million revenue)	--	0.95	1.08	1.16
Non-hazardous waste (metric tons)	92,563	83,938	83,510	101,332
Non-Hazardous waste incinerated (metric tons)	--	--	--	419
Non-Hazardous waste landfilled (metric tons)	--	--	--	3,102
Non-Hazardous waste other disposal method (metric tons)	--	--	--	104
Non-hazardous waste intensity (metric tons/\$1 million revenue)	19.43	17.62	17.53	24.65
Non-Hazardous waste re-used (metric tons)	--	--	--	92,760
Non-hazardous waste recycled (metric tons)	--	2,874	2,874	2,797
Non-hazardous waste recycled intensity (metric tons/\$1 million revenue)	--	0.6	0.6	0.63

**Not all disposal methods and volumes are listed. Disposal totals will not sum.

Water Management

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Water use/intake (1,000 cubic meters)	6,537	6,330	5,652	6,151
Water use/intake in water-stressed areas*** (1,000 cubic meters)	--	--	--	126
Water intake intensity (1,000 cubic meters/\$1 million revenue)	1.37	1.33	1.19	1.39
Wastewater discharge (1,000 cubic meters)	5,357	4,405	3,690	4,208
Wastewater discharge intensity (1,000 cubic meters/\$1 million revenue)	1.12	0.92	0.77	1.02

***As Identified as Drought Conditions/Water Stressed Areas by "Jupiter Climate Risk Analytics" Assessment Data.

SOCIAL

Community Engagement

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Employee volunteering and giving participation rate (%)	--	>8%	~9%	>18%
Total employee volunteer hours	--	~9,000	~9,350	>12,800
Estimated value of employee volunteerism ¹	--	~\$250K	~\$280K	~\$400K
Total employee charitable and community giving	--	~\$50,000	>\$118,500	>\$121,500
Total corporate, employee and Foundation charitable and community giving ²	--	--	--	>\$4M

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total number of global employees	6,080	10,200	9,800	9,760
Total number of global female employees	--	--	--	4,400
Total number of global male employees	--	--	--	5,360
Total number of US employees	--	~32%	~28%	~30%
Total number of OUS employees	--	>68%	~72%	~70%
Total number of unionized employees	--	~140	~200	~200
% Female employees in leadership globally	--	--	32.9%	35.8%
% People of Color in U.S. leadership ³	--	--	16.9%	17.4%
% Female - Exec/Sr. Manager - global	--	30%	31%	37%
% Female - Mid-Level Manager - global	--	32%	34%	36%
% Female - Professionals - global	--	42%	44%	46%
% Female - All Other Worker Levels Not Listed - global	--	45%	45%	46%
% Undisclosed - Exec/Sr. Manager - global	--	--	0%	0%
% Undisclosed - Mid-Level Manager - global	--	1%	1%	0%
% Undisclosed - Professionals - global	--	1%	1%	0%
% Undisclosed - All Other Worker Levels Not Listed - global	--	2%	1%	1%
% Male - Exec/Sr. Manager (global)	--	70%	69%	63%
% Male - Mid-Level Manager (global)	--	67%	66%	64%
% Male - Professionals (global)	--	57%	55%	54%
% Male - All Other Worker Levels Not Listed (global)	--	57%	54%	53%
U.S. People of Color % - Exec/Sr. Manager	--	27%	24%	23%
U.S. People of Color % - Mid-Level Manager	--	19%	15%	16%
U.S. People of Color % - Professionals	--	14%	11%	11%
U.S. People of Color % - All Other Levels Not Leadership	--	16%	11%	11%
% of employees who are members of at least one ERG	--	--	--	20%

Human Capital

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Percent of employees reporting they feel engaged*****	--	77%	69%	66%
Employees by Geographic Location - Africa	--	--	--	1.1%
Employees by Geographic Location - Asia	--	--	--	24.2%
Employees by Geographic Location - Australia and New Zealand	--	--	--	2.8%
Employees by Geographic Location - Central America	--	--	--	2.5%
Employees by Geographic Location - Europe	--	--	--	34.4%
Employees by Geographic Location - North America	--	--	--	30%
Employees by Geographic Location - South America	--	--	--	5%

*****Our 2022 measurements utilize a new engagement index that enables annual external benchmarking, which we seek to match or exceed. This figure is not directly comparable to years 2020 and 2021.

GOVERNANCE

Employee Safety

Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022
Work-related fatalities	0	0	0	0
Lost-time injury and illness rate (per 100 employees) ⁴	0.27	0.21	0.41	0.42
DART (Days Away Restricted Time) injuries	--	--	54	40
Number of Leadership Safety Engagements ⁵	--	1,628	3,601	8,506
Number of Health, Safety and Environment Observations	--	1,925	5,692	5,711

FOOTNOTES

2019-2021 Environmental metrics are attributable to Elanco's worldwide locations with manufacturing and R&D operations.

Please note the increases seen in the 2022 environmental data (GHG emissions, electricity use, water and waste) reflect enhancements in data availability and the expansion of our reporting boundary to reflect full operational control.

¹Value of employee volunteer hours calculated per "[Independent Sector](https://independentsector.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Value-of-Volunteer-Time-by-State-2001-2022.pdf) U.S. National Value" applied to global volunteer hours for 2022 was \$31.80. see <https://independentsector.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Value-of-Volunteer-Time-by-State-2001-2022.pdf>

²Significantly larger number for 2022 is a result of enhanced data tracking and availability.

³Leadership is defined as: Executives, Senior Managers, Mid-level Managers and Professionals.

⁴As defined by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), A lost time injury or illness is a work-induced injury or illness which results in an employee being unable to work a full assigned shift; fatalities and restricted workdays are not included. The rate is determined by the number of lost workdays per 100 full-time employees in the time frame, typically annually.

⁵Leadership Safety Engagements are defined as the number of engagements leadership provides to the organization to promote the emotional connection to safety commitment. Therefore, a higher number is better.