Dollar Tree Inc

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

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

.

01/29/2026, 07:57 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Dollar Tree, Inc. is a leading operator of discount variety stores that has served North America for nearly forty years. Following the completed divestiture of Family Dollar, the Company now operates approximately 8,900 Dollar Tree stores across the 48 contiguous states and five Canadian provinces, supported by a coast-to-coast logistics network and more than 145,000 associates. Dollar Tree is known for its "thrill-of-the-hunt" shopping experience where customers discover new treasures every week, all at a tremendous value. In 2024, the Company achieved a number of strategic milestones to optimize the Family Dollar store operations and subsequently agreed to divest Family Dollar to a consortium consisting of Brigade Capital Management, LP and Macellum Capital Management, LLC. We continue to focus on expanding our multi-price product assortment at Dollar Tree and modernizing our supply chain/technology infrastructure. The actions we're currently taking to optimize our store portfolio are intended to improve our profitability and to better serve the needs of all our key constituents. Our organization has the leadership team in place to drive transformational change and deliver meaningful, long-term improvements in our store operations and across the entire enterprise. Dollar Tree remains committed to achieving science-based net-zero emissions by 2050 in support of the Paris Climate Agreement global goal. Advancing the company's current efforts to mitigate its environmental impact, our near-term science-based targets include: 1) Commit to reduce scope 1 and 2 absolute emissions by 50% by FY2032 based on a FY2023 base year (aligned with a 1.5-degree climate scenario. 2) Commit to have 67% of suppliers by emissions set or commit to science-based targets by FY2029 3) Continue to advance transition to renewable energy sources for our stores, distribution centers, and store support center We're taking a targeted, multi-pronged approach to reducing emissions across our operations and value chain. Our focus is on these 5 key areas: 1. Energy Efficiency We're investing in energy-

efficient upgrades across our stores, distribution centers, and support facilities to reduce both energy consumption and Scope 1 and 2 emissions. These improvements also lower operational costs, enabling us to run smarter and more sustainably. 2. Clean Energy By incorporating clean energy into our electricity and natural gas procurement strategies, we're helping to decarbonize our operations and contribute to broader grid modernization efforts in deregulated markets. 3. Waste Reduction & Recycling Through expanded reuse and recycling initiatives at our stores and distribution centers, we're reducing operational waste, improving diversion rates, and addressing Scope 3 emissions tied to materials and waste. 4. Transportation & Logistics Optimization We're improving route efficiency, adopting fuel-efficient vehicles, and consolidating shipments to reduce fuel use and lower transportation-related Scope 3 emissions across our logistics network. 5. Supplier Engagement By working with our suppliers to set emissions targets and adopt more responsible practices, we're helping to promote positive change across the industry and reduce upstream emissions throughout our value chain. In 2023, we published our first climate risk disclosure aligned with the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). We are updating this report in 2025 to reflect our continued progress and our evolving approach to climate risk and resilience. [Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

01/31/2025

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 1 year

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

Select from:
☑ 1 year

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

Select from:
☑ 1 year
[Fixed row]

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

17565800000

(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:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US2567461080

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

DLTR

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ Canada
☑ United States of America

(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Retailing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Paper

☑ Primary packaging

☑ Secondary packaging

☑ Tertiary packaging

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

We do not procure raw timber directly, but we recognize that forest-based materials are present in both products and packaging. Dollar Tree sells a broad range of consumer goods, including some paper-based products such as bath tissue, napkins, and paper towels. While these items are derived from timber-related commodities and are important within certain product categories, they represent a relatively small portion of our overall revenue when viewed across our full assortment of food, health and beauty, household goods, toys, apparel, etc.

Palm oil

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Retailing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Palm oil derivatives

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

Palm oil and its derivatives may be present in certain products sold at Dollar Tree, primarily within the personal care, food, and household categories. However, palm oil is not considered a key driver of our overall business performance or revenue. That said, we recognize the environmental and social risks associated with palm oil production, particularly related to deforestation and land use change. As part of our commitment to responsible sourcing, we have a Palm Oil Policy in place and are working with our suppliers to improve visibility and reduce sustainability risks within our supply chain.

Rubber

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Retailing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Finished products with rubber components

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Data is not available

(1.22.19) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1500 characters]

Cocoa

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Retailing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Chocolate, snacks

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Data is not available

(1.22.19) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1500 characters]

Coffee

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Retailing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No, the total volume is unknown

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Coffee

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☑ No, not disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☑ Data is not available

(1.22.19) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1500 characters]
[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☑ Smallholders not relevant, and not included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

As part of our greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory efforts, we initially mapped our Tier 1 suppliers across key departments including merchandising, transportation, and service providers. This foundational exercise allowed us to identify priority suppliers and build a targeted engagement strategy to advance our sustainability goals. In 2024, we significantly enhanced our supplier engagement efforts. We integrated more than 100 supplier-specific emission factors into our GHG footprint, improving the accuracy of our Scope 3 emissions calculations. We also began tracking progress toward our goal of engaging suppliers responsible for 67% of our Scope 3 emissions to set their own Scope 1 and 2 reduction targets. As of this year, 12.7% of our suppliers in key categories — Purchased Goods and Services (Category 3.1) and Upstream Transportation and Distribution (Category 3.4) — have either committed to or had targets validated by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). Dollar Tree was included in CDP's 2024 Supplier Engagement Assessment (SEA) A-List, which evaluates companies on governance, Scope 3 emissions, target-

setting, and value chain engagement. We recognize that meaningful climate action requires close collaboration with our value chain partners and remain committed to supporting them on the path to decarbonization.
[Fixed row]

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

	Plastics mapping	Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain	Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)	*We plan to map our plastic value chain in the next few years as part of the EPR packaging reporting exercise*

[Fixed row]

(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?

	Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity	Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No	*Select from:* ☑ Tier 1 suppliers
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No	*Select from:* ☑ Tier 1 suppliers

[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)

5

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

Short-, and medium-term time horizons are aligned to our financial planning timelines.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Short-, and medium-term time horizons are aligned to our financial planning timelines.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

Our long-term time horizon aligns with the time horizon of our climate strategy: achieving science-based net-zero emissions by 2050
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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:
☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:
☑ Every two years

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

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

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Cold wave/frost

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Heat stress

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

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

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

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In early 2025, we updated our inaugural climate scenario analysis, performing a quantitative physical risk exposure assessment aligned to the TCFD recommendations. This update was designed to enhance our understanding of the existing climate risks and opportunities, as well as to identify any new risks and opportunities that may have arisen since our last assessment. The physical risks analysis considered exposure of a 1,000-site sample to drought, extreme temperatures, flooding, hail, high winds, precipitation, severe storms and wildfire. Sites were selected based on asset value, store revenue, local community vulnerability, recent severe weather impacts, geographic diversity and criticality to business continuity. We are using the information from the analysis to inform our risk mitigation and strategic planning and may expand it in the future. Our refresh of the transition risk and opportunity scenario analysis considered changes to Dollar Tree's business, the market we operate in and updates to climate reference scenarios. In performing this refresh, we concluded that the six previously identified transition risks and opportunities remain relevant with similar potential impacts. We will continue to include this analysis in our risk mitigation activities and monitor for potential changes in risks and opportunities in the future. We assessed the impacts of the risks and opportunities under the same science-based climate scenarios used previously, updating for the latest vintage of climate scenarios where available: "High-Carbon Scenario" This scenario assumes low collective action against climate change and a greater degree of global warming. Physical impacts of climate change such as increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events and rising global temperatures are most significant under this scenario. This scenario helps us understand the impact of these physical stressors on our operations, employees, customers and value chain. This scenario was informed by the following sources: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) SSP5-8.5, Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) Nationally Determined Contributions. "Low-Carbon Scenario" This scenario assumes environmental regulation and collective action will limit the greatest physical impacts of climate change. Impacts associated with market and regulatory changes such as carbon prices, product regulations and greater availability of renewable energy are greatest under a low carbon scenario. This scenario helps us understand the range of potential impacts of the transition to a low-carbon economy on our operations, employees, customers and value chain. This scenario was informed by the following sources: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) SSP1-2.6, Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) Net Zero/Divergent Net Zero by 2050 Risks were evaluated over short-, medium- and long-term time horizons to help understand the full range of impacts and prioritize most significant risks and opportunities. Time horizons were defined as follows: • Short-term: 0 – 5 years • Medium-term: 5 – 10 years • Long-term: 10 – 30 years Short- and medium-term time horizons were selected to align to Dollar Tree, Inc.'s financial planning timelines while the long-term time horizon aligns with the time horizon of the enterprise climate strategy [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

Dollar Tree recognizes that climate-related risks, impacts, and opportunities are interdependent and influence our operational, financial, and strategic planning. This is reflected in our updated 2025 climate scenario analysis, which integrates both physical and transition risks and opportunities across a range of time horizons and climate scenarios. For example, we assessed the physical impacts of climate change (including extreme weather events, temperature rise, wildfire risk, etc.) on 1,000 of our facilities, selecting sites based on business criticality, store revenue, and local vulnerability. These risks are not only analyzed in isolation but are tied to broader business impacts such as associate health and productivity, merchandise loss, and property damage. Mitigation strategies (like HVAC upgrades, roof replacements, and community solar subscriptions) are implemented with dual goals of increasing climate resilience and reducing emissions. On the transition side, regulatory risks (e.g., carbon taxes, EPR laws) are directly tied to our Scope 3 emissions and supplier engagement strategy. We are working to mitigate these impacts through active collaboration with suppliers and improved data accuracy. In turn, these efforts help reduce the risk of cost pass-through from suppliers while accelerating our value chain decarbonization and sustainable packaging progress. Opportunities, such as energy efficiency improvements, waste reduction, and customer preference for sustainable products, are also evaluated in relation to climate risks. For instance, product stewardship efforts not only address regulatory pressures but also unlock revenue potential and strengthen brand trust. By embedding climate risk into our Enterprise Risk Management framework and integrating insights from our scenario analyses into corporate strategy, financial planning, and business continuity processes, we ensure a holistic understanding of how environmental dependencies and impacts shape our risks and opportunities.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Other sensitive location, please specify :Dollar Tree has identified priority locations based on exposure to physical climate hazards

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We have identified priority locations across our operations through a structured, risk-based assessment process. As part of our 2025 climate scenario analysis, we conducted a quantitative physical risk assessment of 1,000 priority sites, including stores, distribution centers, and other critical facilities. These locations were selected through a multi-criteria process that considered: Asset value, Store revenue contribution, Recent exposure to severe weather events, Local community vulnerability, and Geographic diversity. This process ensured we prioritized sites with the greatest potential financial and operational exposure to climate-related hazards. The assessment modeled exposure to 12 physical hazards, including extreme heat, drought, severe storms, flooding, hail, high winds, and wildfire. These hazards were analyzed across short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons under both high- and low-carbon climate scenarios, in alignment with TCFD recommendations. Our analysis showed that 95% of these sites are expected to experience elevated exposure to at least one extreme weather hazard by 2030. The top physical hazards Dollar Tree faces include severe storms, extreme heat, and wildfire, which guided the identification of priority geographic areas: -Severe Storm Risk: Sites in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, and Arkansas are prioritized due to their high exposure to hurricanes, tropical storms, and related flooding. -Extreme Heat Risk: Locations in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas face increasing chronic heat risks that may affect associate safety, productivity, and HVAC infrastructure performance. -Wildfire Risk: Facilities in Kentucky, West Virginia, and California were flagged due to increasing wildfire threat, which can impact both store operations and community access. Additionally, Gulf states like Texas and Florida were identified as particularly vulnerable due to their exposure to multiple hazards (e.g., storm, heat, and flooding), making them high-priority regions for climate adaptation and business continuity planning. The results of this analysis are now being used to inform operational decisions, such as where to prioritize HVAC upgrades, roofing reinforcements, enhanced insurance coverage, and resilience training for associates.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

We define a risk that has been classified as a substantive financial or strategic impact based on its likelihood of occurrence, areas of impact, range of magnitude and our readiness to mitigate the risk. If risks and opportunities are identified that may impact the business in the longer term, they may be evaluated and monitored but are not generally considered “substantive” due to the uncertainty associated with the magnitude and duration of their impacts. Dollar Tree has reviewed potential climate-related risks and opportunities for several quantitative factors that may constitute a substantive risk to our business. Note: A topic that is considered to have "substantive financial or strategic impact on our business" may not necessarily be “material" to investors as defined by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

We define an opportunity that has been classified as a substantive financial or strategic impact based on its likelihood of occurrence, areas of impact, range of magnitude and our readiness to capture the opportunity. If risks and opportunities are identified that may impact the business in the longer term, they may be evaluated and monitored but are not generally considered “substantive” due to the uncertainty associated with the magnitude and duration of their impacts. Dollar Tree has reviewed potential climate-related risks and opportunities for several quantitative factors that may constitute a substantive risk to our business. Note: A topic that is considered to have "substantive financial or strategic impact on our business" may not necessarily be “material" to investors as defined by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)
[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:

☑ No, we do not identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.3) Please explain

As a retailer with no manufacturing operations, our direct activities do not typically involve processes that generate water pollutants. While we do not currently identify and classify potential water pollutants, we recognize the importance of protecting water ecosystems and human health. Through our Chemicals and Electronics Recycling Program with g2, we are working to ensure the responsible handling and disposal of regulated materials, particularly chemicals and electronics.
[Fixed row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(3.1.3) Please explain

We have not yet conducted a risk analysis focused on forests, as our efforts have been primarily concentrated on climate, which we believe is more material to our organization.

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(3.1.3) Please explain

We have not yet conducted a risk analysis focused on water, as our efforts have been primarily concentrated on climate, which we believe is more material to our organization. However, we recognize the importance of addressing water risks and plan to conduct an analysis in the future.

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(3.1.3) Please explain

We have not yet conducted a comprehensive risk analysis on plastics, as our focus has been on other priorities. However, given the increasing importance of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) packaging requirements, we plan to address this by conducting an analysis next year.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Tornado

(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

During 2024, a tornado destroyed our Dollar Tree distribution center in Marietta, Oklahoma. In addition to the loss of inventory in the facility and the facility itself, we incurred additional costs due to increased stem miles for product delivery and outside storage for the stores previously serviced by that distribution center, and we expect those costs to continue in 2025.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Closure of operations

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

Select all that apply

☑ The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

Due to the extensive damage to the facility, both the inventory and the facility itself were not salvageable. We recorded losses of $117.0 million in the first quarter of fiscal 2024, consisting of $70.0 million for damaged inventory and $47.0 million for property and equipment. These losses were fully offset by insurance receivables. As of February 1, 2025, we recognized additional insurance receivables of approximately $7.0 million for other property and equipment-related damages expected to be reimbursed under our insurance policy. By the same date, we had received insurance proceeds totaling $150.0 million—$100.0 million for damaged inventory and $50.0 million for damaged property and equipment. For the year ending February 1, 2025, we recorded a gain of $30.0 million, representing the excess of insurance proceeds over the losses from damaged inventory, which is included in "Other (income) expense, net" in the accompanying Consolidated Statements of Operations in our 10-K report.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.18) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

117000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on the significant damage sustained by the facility, the inventory contained in the facility and the facility itself are not salvageable. We incurred losses totaling $117.0 million in the first quarter of fiscal 2024, consisting of $70.0 million related to damaged inventory and $47.0 million related to property and equipment.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Improve monitoring of direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

130000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The $130,000 represents the estimated cost of conducting a climate risk assessment across a representative sample of 1,000 sites. This estimate does not include additional costs incurred from adjustments to our value chain, such as increased stem miles for delivered products or the use of external storage.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We have shifted our supply chain network to deliver products to approximately 600 stores serviced by Marietta, and we believe these efforts have minimized and will continue to minimize disruption to the Dollar Tree shopping experience. We are incurring additional costs within our supply chain due to servicing these impacted stores, including extra stem miles for delivered products and outside storage, and we expect these costs to continue negatively affecting gross margin in the near-to-mid term. Additionally, in early 2025, we conducted a quantitative physical risk exposure assessment aligned with the TCFD recommendations. This update was designed to improve our understanding of existing climate risks and opportunities, as well as to identify any new risks and opportunities that may have emerged since our last assessment. The physical risks analysis considered exposure of a 1,000-site sample to drought, extreme temperatures, flooding, hail, high winds, precipitation, severe storms, and wildfire. Sites were selected based on asset value, store revenue, local community vulnerability, recent severe weather impacts, geographic diversity, and criticality to business continuity. We are using the information from this analysis to guide our risk mitigation and strategic planning and may expand it in the future
[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*No water-related regulatory violations*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Forests

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(3.6.3) Please explain

We have not yet explored opportunities related to forests, as our efforts have been primarily concentrated on climate, which we believe is more material to our organization.

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(3.6.3) Please explain

We have not yet explored opportunities related to water, as our efforts have been primarily concentrated on climate, which we believe is more material to our organization. However, we recognize the potential value of addressing water-related opportunities and plan to explore them in the near future.
[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

Resource efficiency

☑ Use of new technologies

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We partnered with BrainBox AI to pilot and deploy its autonomous HVAC optimization solution in 600 stores across 18 states—spanning 6.6 million square feet. This initiative delivered compelling results: 7,980,916 kWh in electricity savings, $1,028,159 in cost reductions, and 5,632 tCO_2e in avoided emissions. Thanks to its success, the program is being expanded to more than 2,000 additional stores. The AI system integrates with our existing rooftop units (RTUs), enabling dynamic control based on real-time data inputs like weather and occupancy, with no need for major capital upgrades. The solution also reduces unnecessary technician dispatches, improving maintenance efficiency and cost avoidance.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

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

Select from:
☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

$1,028,159 in cost reductions

(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

$1,028,159 in cost reductions

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

1028159

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

$1,028,159 in cost reductions due to lower electricity consumption

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Continue expansion to more than 2,000 additional stores
[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

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ 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

In evaluating candidates for election to the Board, the Nominating and Governance Committee shall take into account the qualifications of the individual candidate as well as the composition of the Board as a whole. Among other things, the Committee shall consider: the need of the Board for directors having relevant knowledge, diversity of background and experience in areas including operations, finance, accounting, technology, marketing, merchandise, human capital management and talent development The Board values diversity, in its broadest sense, reflecting, but not limited to, geography, gender, age, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, national origin, and life experience and is committed to a policy of inclusiveness. The Nominating and Governance Committee endeavors to include women and minority

candidates in the qualified pool from which Board candidates are chosen and, when nominated and elected, to consider such directors for leadership positions on the Board and its committees.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

Forests

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

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

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

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Dollar Tree does not currently have board-level oversight of forest-related issues due to the relative prioritization of other sustainability topics that have a more immediate and material impact on our business operations.

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Dollar Tree does not currently have board-level oversight of water-related issues due to the relative prioritization of other sustainability topics that have a more immediate and material impact on our business operations. That said, we acknowledge the growing importance of water-related concerns and continuously evaluate our governance framework to ensure that emerging issues are addressed in alignment with our long-term sustainability strategy.

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Not an immediate strategic priority
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Dollar Tree, Inc. Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee Charter

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board of Directors plays a crucial role in overseeing environmental and social sustainability, ensuring that the company's strategies and decisions align with its broader vision, including addressing climate change. To enhance this oversight, a dedicated Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee (SCSRC) was established in 2022. The SCSRC's responsibilities include advising the Board on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) issues, assessing risks and opportunities related to climate and other CSR matters, and overseeing the company's strategy, policies, initiatives, and performance in these areas. The committee reports to the Board and meets quarterly to discuss and monitor these issues. The SCSRC is composed of at least three members who are knowledgeable in sustainability, environmental, and social matters. Members and the Chairperson are appointed by the Board, based on recommendations from the Nominating and Governance Committee. The Board remains informed about environmental risks to the business and approves the company's environmental and sustainability strategies. Last year, the Board approved science-based targets for achieving net-zero emissions by 2050, as well as short-term goals and a decarbonization strategy to achieve these goals. Our short-term goals include: -Reducing Scope 1 and 2 absolute emissions by 50% by FY2032, using FY2023 as the base year, in alignment with a 1.5-degree climate scenario. -Ensuring that 67% of suppliers, by emissions, set or commit to science-aligned targets by FY2029. -Continuing the transition to renewable energy sources for stores, distribution centers, and the store support center.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic
☑ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Masters of Liberal Arts, Sustainability Studies by Harvard Extension School

Additional training

☑ Course certificate (relating to environmental issues), please specify :Corporate Sustainability and Innovation by Harvard University and Sustainable Business Strategy by Harvard Online Business School

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic

☑ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Masters of Liberal Arts, Sustainability Studies by Harvard Extension School

Additional training

☑ Course certificate (relating to environmental issues), please specify :Corporate Sustainability and Innovation by Harvard University and Sustainable Business Strategy by Harvard Online Business School

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic

☑ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Masters of Liberal Arts, Sustainability Studies by Harvard Extension School

Additional training

☑ Course certificate (relating to environmental issues), please specify :Corporate Sustainability and Innovation by Harvard University and Sustainable Business Strategy by Harvard Online Business School

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue	Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues	Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*No standardized procedure*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Sustainability and Corporate Affairs Officer, and Chief Legal Officer (CLO) are responsible for managing the company's overall sustainability risks and providing periodic reports to the Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee (SCSRC) on relevant climate and sustainability risks

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Reports to the Chief People Officer (CPO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Sustainability and Corporate Affairs Officer, and Chief Legal Officer (CLO) are responsible for managing the company's overall sustainability risks and providing periodic reports to the Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee (SCSRC) on relevant climate and sustainability risks

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Reports to Chief People Officer (CPO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Sustainability and Corporate Affairs Officer, and Chief Legal Officer (CLO) are responsible for managing the company's overall sustainability risks and providing periodic reports to the Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee (SCSRC) on relevant climate and sustainability risks.
[Add row]

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

	Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue	Please explain
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years	*No, but we plan to introduce them in the next two years*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years	*No plan to introduce them in the next two years*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years	*No plan to introduce them in the next two years*

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Organization-wide, including the operations of our stores and distribution centers. Including our tier 1 suppliers for Scope 3 emission goals

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

2024 Sustainability Report.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Dollar Tree encourages our suppliers of national brand products and private label goods to find safer alternatives to the chemicals listed on our priority chemical list and continue to innovate and provide options for safe, effective products that meet the expectations of our consumers. Dollar Tree has adopted this Policy as part of our commitment to providing our customers with safe, sustainable, exciting and affordable products. We are committed to complying with, as well as going beyond, all applicable federal, state and local laws regarding chemicals in our products. The Company has developed this Policy in concert with our stakeholders and with guidance from internationally accepted health and safety standards.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Chemical_Policy (2).pdf

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

☑ Other, please specify :Clean Energy Buyers Alliance (CEBA), Better Climate Challenge through the Department of Energy

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

TCFD: We did our first TCFD assessment in 2022–2023 to assess exposure to climate-related risks and opportunities and updated this assessment in early 2025. Clean Energy Buyers Alliance (CEBA): we joined the Clean Energy Buyers Alliance (CEBA) to further our commitment to procuring clean energy and supporting the development of new renewable assets. Better Climate Challenge: through the Better Climate Challenge, Dollar Tree partners with the DOE to reduce portfolio-wide GHG emissions (scope 1 & 2) by at least 50% within 10 years. DOE will provide technical assistance and opportunities to learn and share actionable best practices for carbon reduction.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

2024 Sustainability Report.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Dollar Tree engages collaboratively with industry associations, supply chain partners, and external stakeholders to support progress toward a more sustainable future. We align our external engagement activities with our environmental and broader sustainability goals by prioritizing partnerships and advocacy efforts that promote emissions reduction, responsible sourcing, and regulatory compliance. For example, we participate in the Retail Industry Leaders Association (RILA) Sustainability Committee to stay aligned with retail sustainability best practices. We also collaborate very closely with The Recyling Partnership, SPC, The Center for the Circular Economy at Closed Loop Partners, and other organizations.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ US Chamber of Commerce

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Dollar Tree's sustainability initiatives reflect an approach that balances environmental responsibility with economic growth, consistent with the USCC's emphasis on integrating sustainability into business practices without compromising economic performance. Dollar Tree's investment in energy-efficient technologies and waste

reduction aligns with the USCC's support for technological innovation as a means to improve environmental performance. Both organizations recognize the role of technology in advancing sustainability goals

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Virginia Chamber of Commerce

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

As stated in Blueprint Virginia 2030, the Virginia Corporate Sustainability and Environmental Executive Committee of the Virginia Chamber supports efforts to empower energy users with detailed information about their usage and emissions footprint and promote rate designs that leverage price signals to encourage more active management of energy consumption. In addition, they promote responsible and geographically diverse in-state deployment of energy resource types required by recent policy changes, including solar, wind, and energy storage.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Retail Industry Leaders Association

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Dollar Tree's targets for carbon footprint reduction are in line with RILA's goals for the retail industry to enhance energy efficiency and lower greenhouse gas emissions. Dollar Tree actively participates in RILA's working groups and forums, contributing to discussions on sustainability standards and practices. This involvement helps shape industry-wide policies and ensures Dollar Tree's practices are aligned with emerging standards.

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

90000

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

This is the annual membership fee, not funding to influence policy

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement

Row 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America
☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :National Retail Federation

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Dollar Tree's sustainability initiatives align with several key principles of the National Retail Federation, including sustainable retail practices, consumer engagement, and innovation. Dollar Tree's commitment to transparent and detailed sustainability reporting supports NRF's call for greater accountability in the retail sector. This includes sharing progress on sustainability goals and initiatives that align with NRF's emphasis on responsible retail practices. Dollar Tree actively participates in NRF's sustainability initiatives and working groups, contributing to discussions on best practices and industry standards. This involvement helps ensure that Dollar Tree's practices are in line with NRF's recommendations.

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

95000

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

This is the annual membership fee, not funding to influence policy

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Underway - previous year attached

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024 Sustainability Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 1500 characters]
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Every two years

Forests

(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

Not an immediate 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

While water management is undeniably a critical aspect of environmental stewardship, our comprehensive materiality assessment revealed that it is not the most pressing issue for our business at this time. The analysis showed that other sustainability challenges, such as greenhouse gas emissions, present more immediate risks and opportunities for impact. Although we recognize the importance of water management, our strategy will focus on addressing these top-priority material issues where we can drive the greatest value and progress.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :This scenario was informed by the following sources: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) SSP1-2.6, Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) Net Zero/Divergent Net Zero by 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Carbon Pricing Implementation: One key assumption is that carbon pricing mechanisms will be implemented in the US. This includes the assumption that regulatory bodies will enforce carbon taxes or similar policies aligned with the Net Zero by 2050 scenario. Market and Regulatory Changes: It is assumed that the market and regulatory environment will shift towards supporting a low-carbon economy. This includes the adoption of policies that incentivize or mandate reductions in carbon emissions. Operational Impact Sensitivity: The scenarios assume that Dollar Tree's operations and supply chain will be sensitive to changes in carbon pricing. This means that carbon taxes could significantly affect operational costs and supply chain logistics. Consistent Scenario Framework: The analysis assumes that the NGFS scenarios framework provides a consistent and reliable basis for modeling future conditions. This includes the validity of the Net Zero by 2050 scenario in predicting future economic and environmental conditions. Adaptation and Mitigation Responses: It is assumed that Dollar Tree will actively respond to the identified risks through adaptation and mitigation strategies. This includes investments in energy efficiency, supply chain adjustments, and other sustainability initiatives. Static vs. Dynamic Analysis: The scenario assumes a degree of static analysis, where historic data is extrapolated into the future. There may be an assumption that past trends and data points are indicative of future conditions, despite potential dynamic changes in the market or regulatory landscape.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Understanding Impact of Transition: The primary rationale is to comprehend the range of potential impacts the transition to a low-carbon economy might have on Dollar Tree's operations. By using the NGFS scenarios framework, Dollar Tree aims to anticipate changes and adapt accordingly. Carbon Pricing: The use of the

NGFS's Net Zero by 2050 scenario to model potential carbon prices helps Dollar Tree understand the financial implications of carbon taxes if implemented in the US. This foresight is crucial for strategic planning and financial management. Alignment with Climate Goals: By focusing on the Net Zero scenario, Dollar Tree ensures its analysis aligns with a 1.5 ºC target, consistent with global climate goals. This alignment is important for staying relevant and compliant with future regulatory and market expectations. Risk Analysis Across Timeframes: Analyzing risks in the short, medium, and long term allows Dollar Tree to prepare for immediate, mid-term, and future challenges. This comprehensive approach helps in developing robust strategies that ensure sustainability and resilience over time. Historical Data Integration: Leveraging relevant historical Dollar Tree data ensures that the analysis is grounded in the company's actual operational context. This integration provides a realistic basis for projecting future impacts and risks.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :This scenario was informed by the following sources: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) SSP5-8.5, Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) Nationally Determined Contributions

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In the NGFS Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) scenario for Dollar Tree, the main assumptions include the full implementation of current national climate commitments, moderate carbon pricing, and the continued availability of financial resources for sustainability initiatives. It assumes Dollar Tree will leverage historic data to model potential impacts and invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy to mitigate increased operational costs. There is an assumption that suppliers will collaborate in reducing their emissions and that consumer demand for sustainable products will rise. Uncertainties include the degree of policy enforcement, the pace of technological advancements, and the variability in consumer behavior towards sustainability. Economic conditions, such as potential recessions or booms, add another layer of unpredictability. The ability of suppliers to meet environmental standards and the potential for regulatory changes also contribute to uncertainty. Constraints involve financial limitations for sustainability investments, technological barriers in scaling up low-carbon solutions, and political resistance to stringent climate policies. Additionally, institutional inertia and potential geopolitical tensions can impede international cooperation and the flow of clean technologies. Dollar Tree must navigate these complexities to achieve resilience and continued growth amid the transition to a low-carbon economy.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Less Collective Climate Action: By focusing on the NDC scenario, Dollar Tree aims to understand the impacts in a world where climate action is less coordinated and ambitious. This scenario reflects a more conservative approach to climate policies, which is critical for planning in case global climate initiatives do not progress as aggressively as expected. Risk Analysis Across Timeframes: Analyzing risks in the short (0-5 years), medium (5-10 years), and long term (10-30 years) allows Dollar Tree to prepare for immediate, mid-term, and future challenges, ensuring comprehensive strategic planning. Informed Decision Making: Using the NDC scenario, along with supplemental research and historical Dollar Tree data, provides a grounded and realistic basis for making informed decisions about future investments, operational adjustments, and sustainability initiatives.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

1995

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance
☑ Cost of capital
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Sustainable Practices Adoption: The scenario assumes that societies worldwide will adopt more sustainable practices and achieve global net zero emissions around 2050. This includes significant changes in policies, technologies, and societal behaviors. Accurate Projections: The analysis assumes that the storm frequency, intensity, and temperature rise projections provided are accurate and reflective of future conditions. These projections are critical for anticipating the physical impacts of climate change. Impact on Operations: There is an assumption that extreme weather events and increased temperatures will have a noticeable impact on Dollar Tree's operations and workforce. This includes potential disruptions in supply chains, increased operational costs, and health-related productivity losses. Relevance of Historic Data: The scenario assumes that historical Dollar Tree data is relevant and can be used to predict future impacts. Regulatory and Market Changes: It is

assumed that regulatory and market changes will align with the transition to a low-carbon economy, influencing how extreme weather and temperature changes impact Dollar Tree. This includes anticipated shifts in regulatory requirements and market expectations.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Understanding Physical Climate Impacts: The rationale for using IPCC's Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP) 1-2.6, aligned with RCP 2.6, is to understand the physical impacts of climate change under a low-carbon scenario. This scenario assumes significant mitigation efforts and sustainable practices, providing a framework for analyzing future environmental conditions. Storm and Temperature Projections: By leveraging storm frequency and intensity projections, as well as temperature rise projections from SSP 1-2.6, Dollar Tree aims to assess how extreme weather events and increased heat might affect its operations and associates. Understanding these impacts is crucial for developing strategies to enhance resilience. Labor Productivity: Analyzing the projections of extreme heat and their impacts on labor productivity helps Dollar Tree anticipate and mitigate potential decreases in workforce efficiency and health issues related to heat stress. Comprehensive Risk Analysis: Conducting risk analysis in the short (0-5 years), medium (5-10 years), and long term (10-30 years) enables Dollar Tree to prepare for immediate, mid-term, and future challenges. This holistic approach ensures robust planning and adaptive strategies. Data-Driven Decisions: Using these scenarios alongside supplemental research and historical Dollar Tree data allows for informed decision-making. This grounded approach ensures that strategies are based on realistic projections and past experiences.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

1995

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Under RCP 4.5, which assumes moderate climate change and increasing regulatory pressure, Dollar Tree faces a mix of operational and strategic challenges. The company must prepare for stronger environmental regulations, such as EPR laws and climate disclosure mandates in states like California. While physical climate risks like storms and heatwaves may not be extreme, they still threaten stores and distribution centers, especially in vulnerable areas. Consumers are increasingly demanding safer, more sustainable products, but Dollar Tree's price-sensitive model limits flexibility to invest in greener alternatives. Key uncertainties include the pace of federal regulation, supply chain resilience, and whether value-driven shoppers will prioritize sustainability. Constraints such as limited supplier transparency, fragmented data systems, and a lean internal team complicate progress on emissions tracking, chemical safety, and packaging improvements. Navigating this evolving landscape will require prioritizing compliance, improving data access, and balancing affordability with rising expectations from regulators, investors, and consumers.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

RCP 4.5 was selected as a medium pathway scenario—neither overly optimistic nor pessimistic—providing a balanced outlook on future climate risks and regulatory trends. It assumes that global greenhouse gas emissions will peak around 2040 due to moderate mitigation efforts, leading to a manageable rise in global temperatures. This aligns with the pace of current U.S. and state-level policy developments, growing consumer awareness, and gradual corporate shifts toward sustainability. For a company like Dollar Tree, which operates on thin margins and serves cost-conscious consumers, RCP 4.5 presents a realistic planning framework that reflects increasing—but not overwhelming—pressures related to environmental compliance, supply chain risk, and product responsibility.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

1995

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Fossil Fuel-Driven Growth: The scenario assumes that economic growth continues to be driven primarily by fossil fuels, with little to no significant shift towards sustainable energy sources. This leads to ongoing high greenhouse gas emissions. Accurate Projections: The analysis assumes that the storm frequency, intensity, and temperature rise projections provided are accurate and reflective of future conditions. These projections are crucial for anticipating the physical impacts of climate change. Impact on Operations: There is an assumption that extreme weather events and increased temperatures will have a significant impact on Dollar Tree's operations and workforce. This includes potential disruptions in supply chains, increased operational costs, and health-related productivity losses. Relevance of Historic Data: The scenario assumes that historical Dollar Tree data is relevant and can be used to predict future impacts. Regulatory and Market Changes: It is assumed that regulatory and market changes will be minimal, with limited efforts to curb fossil fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The rationale for using RCP 8.5, is to comprehend the physical impacts of climate change under a high-carbon scenario. This scenario assumes continued economic growth driven by fossil fuels, leading to significant global temperature rises and more severe climate effects. Assessing Extreme Weather and Heat: By leveraging storm frequency and intensity projections, as well as temperature rise projections, Dollar Tree aims to evaluate how extreme weather events and increased heat might affect its operations and associates in a high-carbon future. Evaluating Labor Productivity: Analyzing the impacts of extreme heat on labor productivity under this scenario helps Dollar Tree anticipate and plan for potential decreases in workforce efficiency and health issues related to heat stress. Comprehensive Risk Analysis: Conducting risk analysis in the short (0-5 years), medium (5-10 years), and long term (10-30 years) enables Dollar Tree to prepare for immediate, mid-term, and future challenges. This comprehensive approach ensures robust strategic planning and adaptive measures. Data-Driven Decision Making: Using these scenarios, alongside supplemental research and historical Dollar Tree data, provides a grounded basis for making informed decisions. This approach ensures that strategies are based on realistic projections and past experiences.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Outcomes Dollar Tree's climate risk assessment identified physical risks to its facilities under different scenarios, with more pronounced impacts under RCP 8.5. Increased frequency and severity of extreme storms could lead to store closures due to blocked access, power outages, damaged infrastructure, property damage from wind and flooding, inventory loss, and associate displacement. Rising temperatures can impact associates' physical and mental well-being, increase absenteeism, and decrease productivity in stores and distribution centers. Transitional risks identified under NGFS scenarios, especially the Net Zero / Divergent Net Zero scenario, include potential cost increases from regulations such as carbon taxes, building efficiency codes, and product-specific regulations. These regulations could also increase supplier costs, potentially passed on to Dollar Tree, which is constrained in raising prices due to its value-based retail model, posing risks to profit margins and product selection. Business Process Influenced Dollar Tree includes extreme weather events in risk assessment and disaster planning for stores and critical infrastructure, using measures like asset hardening and supporting associates through the Associate Relief Fund. To mitigate extreme heat risks, Dollar Tree has implemented an OSHA-compliant heat safety program at all distribution centers, climate controls in all stores, and energy efficiency measures such as cool roofs and low-emissivity windows. To mitigate transition risks we recently committed to achieve science-based net-zero emissions by 2050 in support of the Paris Climate Agreement global goal. Advancing the company's current efforts to mitigate its environmental impact, our near-term science-based targets include: Commit to reduce scope 1 and 2 absolute emissions by 50% by FY2032 based on a FY2023 base year (aligned with a 1.5-degree climate scenario) Commit to have 67% of suppliers by emissions set or commit to science-based targets by FY2029 Continue to advance transition to renewable energy sources for our stores, distribution centers, and store support center We mapped our greenhouse gas emissions footprint across our value chain to develop a clear understanding of where to focus our efforts, which informs our pathway to net-zero.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 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

While we are deeply committed to sustainability and reducing our environmental impact, we must also consider a variety of factors in our operational and strategic decisions. Here are a few key reasons why we have not explicitly committed to ceasing all spending on activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion: Transition Period: The global economy is still heavily dependent on fossil fuels, and an immediate halt in related activities could disrupt our business operations, supply chains, and the broader economy. We are focused on a gradual transition that allows us to adapt and shift towards more sustainable energy sources without causing significant economic instability. Investing in Innovation: Some of our activities related to fossil fuels involve investing in innovative technologies that aim to reduce emissions and improve energy efficiency. These investments are crucial for developing the next generation of sustainable energy solutions. Stakeholder Responsibilities: We have a responsibility to our stakeholders, including employees, customers, and investors, to ensure the company remains financially viable and can continue to provide value. A sudden withdrawal from fossil fuel-related activities could negatively impact our financial health and, consequently, our ability to invest in sustainable initiatives. Regulatory and Market Dynamics: The regulatory landscape and market dynamics play a significant role in shaping our strategy. We are actively engaged with policymakers and industry partners to support the transition to a low-carbon economy, but we must also navigate existing regulations and market conditions. Comprehensive Approach to Sustainability: Our approach to sustainability is comprehensive and multifaceted. We are investing in renewable energy, enhancing energy efficiency, and working towards reducing our carbon footprint. By balancing our efforts across different areas, we aim to achieve meaningful and lasting progress. We are committed to transparency and continuous improvement in our sustainability practices. While we may not have made an explicit commitment to cease all fossil fuel-related activities, we remain dedicated to advancing our sustainability goals and contributing to a more sustainable future.

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

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

Our Climate Transition plan is voted on at the Board Meeting, specifically during the Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Committee meeting

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ More frequently than annually

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

As part of Dollar Tree's decarbonization plan, our approach relies on several key assumptions that guide our efforts towards achieving our net-zero goals: Grid Greening: We're assuming that the electrical grid will continue to transition to more renewable energy sources, which will help reduce our Scope 2 emissions over time. Store Growth: Our emissions projections incorporate a store growth rate of 1.9% through 2032. Energy Efficiency Initiatives: We're counting on the successful implementation of energy efficiency measures, such as HVAC upgrades, deployment of an enterprise-wide EMS (Energy Management System), and replacing refrigerants and cooler doors. While we've identified these initiatives as key drivers of emissions reductions, their execution depends on both internal budgetary approvals and external market conditions. Renewable Energy Procurement: Our plan assumes that renewable energy procurement—via power purchase agreements (PPAs) and other renewable energy strategies—will be a major lever in reducing our Scope 2 emissions. We're working on securing agreements that will provide reliable and cost-effective renewable energy to our operations. Supplier Engagement: For Scope 3 emissions, a major assumption is that we will be able to engage our top-emitting suppliers and encourage them to set and meet science-based targets. These assumptions form the backbone of our decarbonization strategy and will guide our efforts to reach net-zero emissions by 2050.

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

In the past year, Dollar Tree advanced its enterprise-wide decarbonization strategy across operations (Scopes 1 and 2) and the value chain (Scope 3), with measurable progress toward its goal to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 50% by 2032. Key achievements included significant investments in energy efficiency—approximately $94 million in smart energy management systems, LED retrofits, and high-efficiency HVAC replacements—alongside the deployment of AI-driven HVAC optimization in 600 stores, generating 7.98 million kWh in electricity savings and avoiding 5,632 tCO_2e. Nearly all stores now have interior LED lighting and EMS coverage, and new builds follow the In-Store Energy Efficiency Standard. We expanded our clean energy portfolio through community solar subscriptions in Illinois, New York, and Maine; procurement of nuclear energy in Illinois; and long-term renewable energy agreements in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Texas, and California. These initiatives support emissions reductions while managing energy cost volatility, with our first major PPA scheduled to deliver 79,000 MWh of solar power annually beginning in 2026. Our waste diversion rate was 63.4%, supported by a 33% increase in recycled materials and the expansion of our Chemical and Electronics Recycling Program to 7,955 stores. Transportation efficiency efforts continued through SmartWay-aligned carrier engagement, intermodal transport, load optimization, and network improvements. Supplier engagement advanced with the integration of over 100 supplier-specific emission factors, tracking toward our goal of engaging suppliers responsible for 67% of Scope 3 emissions. As of 2024, 12.7% of key suppliers have set or committed to Science Based Targets. Dollar Tree was named to CDP's 2024 Supplier Engagement A-List for its governance, data quality, and value chain collaboration. This progress reflects a balanced focus on near-term emission reductions, supply chain engagement, and investments in scalable, long-term solutions consistent with our transition plan.

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered
[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
☑ 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
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Environmental risks and opportunities—particularly in the areas of chemical management and packaging—have directly influenced our product stewardship strategy. In 2024, we advanced our approach to ensure products are safe, affordable, and responsibly designed, responding to evolving regulations, stakeholder expectations, and market trends. In chemical management, we require all vendors supplying formulated products to disclose ingredients through UL WERCSmart, enabling us to screen for chemicals of concern and improve supply chain transparency. We maintain rigorous third-party testing of imported products, with frequency determined by product risk. In partnership with Pure Strategies, we are updating our Chemical Policy to expand the Restricted Substance List, strengthen supplier accountability, and formalize governance. We also prohibited intentional PFAS use in ten product categories across all brands, with supplier engagement already leading to phase-outs. These actions not only mitigate regulatory risk but also position us to attract customers seeking safer and more sustainable products. On packaging, we submitted our first Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) report in Oregon, collecting data for over 2,400 private label SKUs and establishing our first packaging baseline. This new visibility enables us to identify opportunities to reduce packaging weights and transition to more easily recyclable materials, lowering EPR fees, reducing transportation emissions, and improving recyclability. By addressing these environmental factors proactively, we are mitigating regulatory and reputational risks while creating opportunities to deliver safer, more sustainable products to our customers.

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

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

Environmental risks and opportunities have become a central driver of our operational strategy. This year, we did a quantitative climate risk analysis across 1,000 of our facilities to assess exposure to physical risks Physical risks—such as extreme weather, heat, flooding, and storms—have informed how we plan, build, and operate our facilities, leading to measures like HVAC upgrades, asset hardening, disaster preparedness programs, and enhanced insurance coverage. Transition risks, including evolving climate regulations, supplier carbon pricing, and renewable energy market shifts, have shaped our investment in data systems, Scope 3 supplier engagement, and a diversified clean energy portfolio. Opportunities are equally shaping strategy. We are expanding chemical management and packaging initiatives that improve supply chain transparency, reduce packaging weights, and transition to more recyclable materials, lowering Extended Producer Responsibility fees. These actions also position us to attract new customers seeking safer, more sustainable products. Additionally, $94 million in recent energy efficiency investments are reducing emissions, cutting costs, and improving resilience across our operations.

[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

☑ Direct costs

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Assets

☑ Liabilities

(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 quantitative climate risk analysis across 1,000 facilities identified exposure to extreme heat, flooding, storms, and other hazards prompting HVAC upgrades, reinforcements, and other improvements. These measures increase capex in the near term but are expected to reduce direct costs from energy use, insurance premiums, and facility repairs. Transition risks—such as new climate disclosure regulations and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) laws—affect indirect costs through compliance, reporting, fees, and supplier engagement. Packaging and chemical management initiatives are being implemented to lower EPR fees, reduce

risk, and improve brand positioning, potentially boosting revenue. Our assets are being protected and made more resilient through infrastructure improvements and diversified renewable energy sourcing, while liabilities are reduced by mitigating regulatory non-compliance risks and avoiding penalties.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Not measured
[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☑ Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

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

Dollar Tree does not have an internal pricing system mainly for the following two reasons: Cost Management: Implementing and maintaining an internal pricing system can be expensive. Dollar Tree operates on a high-volume, low-margin model, so controlling costs is crucial. Operational Complexity: An internal pricing system requires significant resources for development, implementation, and ongoing management. Currently, Dollar Tree is focusing its resources on other climate initiatives, making it challenging to allocate the necessary investment and manpower for such a complex system.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Suppliers that account for 67% of our total Scope 3 emissions or 67% of emissions in any specific product or service category are classified as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment. Except for three suppliers, those meeting this threshold contribute at least 100,000 kg of CO2 to our Scope 3 emissions.

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

342

Forests

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :% of contribution to our Private Label packaging weights

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Suppliers that represent 80% of our private label packaging shipped to the state of Oregon (first state with EPR packaging law implementation)

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

157

Water

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

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

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We have committed to ensuring that 67% of our suppliers by emissions set or commit to science-based targets by FY2029. To achieve this, we have identified the suppliers that account for 67% of our total Scope 3 emissions. Additionally, we have pinpointed suppliers representing 67% of emissions within each product and service category. We have prioritized these suppliers and have begun our engagement efforts to meet our 2029 goal.

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Suppliers that represent 80% of our private label packaging shipped to the state of Oregon (first state with EPR packaging law implementation)

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ No, we do not prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.3) Primary reason for no supplier prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Not an immediate strategic priority
[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, but we plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years	*We plan to introduce environmental requirements related to our Scope 3 goal within the next couple of years*
Forests	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years	*We plan to introduce requirements related to our EPR packaging goals within the next couple of years*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years	*Not an immediate strategic priority*

[Fixed row]

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

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(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 set science-based targets

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

In 2024, we launched our supplier engagement program, targeting suppliers that account for 67% of our Scope 3 emissions. We plan to categorize our suppliers into different maturity levels and provide support to those in the early stages. Support includes guidance on calculating GHG footprints, setting targets, and identifying emission reduction initiatives. Currently, 13% of our supply chain emissions have SBTi validated goals. In addition, in the Transportation sector, we have engaged with over 40 of our suppliers and prioritized carriers with Tier 1 performance in the SmartWay program. As a result, we were awarded the SmartWay Excellence Award

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

Forests

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

[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

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization’s goals to support customers’ targets and ambitions

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

In late 2023, Dollar Tree conducted a comprehensive customer survey with the following objectives: 1. Assess the Importance of Sustainability: To gauge how crucial sustainability is for our customers when selecting products at Dollar Tree. 2. Identify Key Categories: To determine which product categories our customers prioritize in terms of sustainability. 3. Understand Sustainability Drivers: To explore the factors driving sustainability preferences in various categories 4. Define Sustainability: To understand how our shoppers define sustainability and what it means to them in the context of their purchasing decisions. 5. Identify Barriers: To uncover the barriers preventing customers from purchasing sustainable products at our stores.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The customer survey conducted in late 2023 to 1,586 respondents revealed several key insights into the importance of sustainability for our shoppers at Dollar Tree: 1. Purchase Drivers: While price and quality remain the top drivers, over half of our customers consider sustainability important, and 60% have chosen products specifically because they were more sustainable than similar options. 2. Barriers to Sustainable Purchases: The primary barrier to purchasing sustainable products is the higher cost. However, Dollar Tree is uniquely positioned to address this issue by offering affordable sustainable options. Although there are some perceptions that lower-cost sustainable items may be of lower quality, the majority of our customers do not share this belief. 3. Health-Related Products: Sustainability is particularly important for products that impact health, such as household cleaning supplies, over-the-counter medications, and food and beverages. Customers look for certifications like Non-GMO, Cruelty-Free, and Organic in these categories. 4. Certification and Value Addition: While customers may not actively seek out sustainable items, offering affordable options with well-known certifications can add significant value and positively influence brand perception. Negative perceptions about lower-cost sustainable items can be mitigated by focusing on trusted certifications (e.g., USDA Organic).

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(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

To better understand our shareholders' perspectives, we requested engagement meetings with our top 50 shareholders representing 80% of our outstanding shares and met with 20 shareholders representing 48% of our outstanding shares. Through this collaborative exchange, we aim to align our actions closely with shareholder expectations and enhance the overall effectiveness of our sustainability and social impact efforts.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

By directly engaging with shareholders, the company gains a clearer understanding of their priorities and concerns. This allows the company to adjust its strategies and actions to better align with shareholder expectations, particularly in areas such as sustainability and social impact
[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Based on the Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHG Protocol) and an understanding of good market practices in reporting, DTS has chosen to employ the operational control approach. Operational control, as defined by the GHG Protocol, is when "a company has operational control over an operation if the former or one of its subsidiaries has the full authority to introduce and implement its operating policies at the operation. This criterion is consistent with the current accounting and reporting practice of many companies that report on emissions from facilities, which they operate (i.e., for which they hold the operating license). It is expected that except in very rare circumstances, if the company or one of its subsidiaries is the operator of a facility, it will have the full authority to introduce and implement its operating policies and thus has operational control." An example of such an operating policy could be DTS' ability to control the temperature in retail stores or to use and/or install certain technology products to promote greater energy and/or water efficiency. Any facility that meets the GHG Protocol definition of operational control is included within the reporting boundary.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

DTS has chosen to employ the operational control approach. Operational control refers to a situation where "a company has full authority to introduce and implement operational policies at a facility it operates, either directly or through one of its subsidiaries." This approach is consistent with common practices across industries for

reporting metrics such as energy consumption, water usage, waste management, and other sustainability factors. For instance, if DTS or one of its subsidiaries operates a facility, it typically has the full authority to implement policies that affect the relevant metrics

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

DTS has chosen to employ the operational control approach. Operational control refers to a situation where "a company has full authority to introduce and implement operational policies at a facility it operates, either directly or through one of its subsidiaries." This approach is consistent with common practices across industries for reporting metrics such as energy consumption, water usage, waste management, and other sustainability factors. For instance, if DTS or one of its subsidiaries operates a facility, it typically has the full authority to implement policies that affect the relevant metrics

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

DTS has chosen to employ the operational control approach. Operational control refers to a situation where "a company has full authority to introduce and implement operational policies at a facility it operates, either directly or through one of its subsidiaries." This approach is consistent with common practices across industries for reporting metrics such as energy consumption, water usage, waste management, and other sustainability factors. For instance, if DTS or one of its subsidiaries operates a facility, it typically has the full authority to implement policies that affect the relevant metrics

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

DTS has chosen to employ the operational control approach. Operational control refers to a situation where "a company has full authority to introduce and implement operational policies at a facility it operates, either directly or through one of its subsidiaries." This approach is consistent with common practices across industries for reporting metrics such as energy consumption, water usage, waste management, and other sustainability factors. For instance, if DTS or one of its subsidiaries operates a facility, it typically has the full authority to implement policies that affect the relevant metrics
[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, a divestment

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

Family Dollar

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

In fiscal year 2024, Dollar Tree conducted a comprehensive review of strategic alternatives for the Family Dollar business. This strategic alternatives review concluded in the fourth quarter of fiscal 2024 and resulted in the decision to sell the Family Dollar business. Accordingly, the Family Dollar business met the held for sale and discontinued operations accounting criteria. Unless otherwise noted, the discussion throughout this report, including the various metrics cited, excludes the Family Dollar business and pertains only to our continuing operations.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2, market-based

☑ Scope 3

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

Because the Family Dollar divestiture accounted for 40–50% of our Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, we rebaselined our FY 2023 footprint, establishing it as the new baseline for our short- and long-term net zero goals.

(7.1.3.4) Past years’ recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*Dollar Tree is reporting both location-based and market-based Scope 2.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

204037.08

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We include the assessment of GHGs associated with stationary combustion in company owned buildings or facilities, emissions of refrigerants, emissions of company-owned vehicles and aircrafts, as well as the backup generators. For fuel stationary combustion in buildings and facilities, we collect the data on fuel consumption for each building or shared workspace used by the company. The primary data on fuel consumption typically comes from the utility-bills and internal meter readings or landlord provided consumption. If primary activity data is not available, benchmarks for fuel consumption per floor area by building type and fuel type breakdown from Building Performance Database are applied as a secondary activity data to estimate consumption. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant CO2e emission factor (EF) for that fuel. We use US EPA and DEFRA EFs for fuel combustion. Fugitive emissions from refrigerants are measured using the purchase data on refrigerant refills. We use a conservative assumption that all refrigerant refills are due to the refrigerant leakage. If purchase data is not available, refrigerant leakage is estimated based on building floor area using EPA HFC accounting tool. Refrigerant quantities are multiplied by their 100-year GWP from IPCC. Company-owned and company-operated vehicle combustion emissions are evaluated as Scope 1, while company-owned electric vehicle emissions are evaluated in Scope 2. This methodology collects fuel use data or vehicle class, distance traveled, and location data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel use or distance by relevant emission factors coming from US EPA, DEFRA, and ecoinvent. Company-owned and company-operated aircraft emissions are calculated using flight records, aircraft make/model, and fuel consumption data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel consumed by jet fuel emission factors from the US EPA. Backup generators or other stationary sources that are not otherwise used for regular building heating result in Scope 1 combustion emissions. This methodology collects fuel use data and calculate emissions by multiplying fuel consumption by the relevant emission factors for each fuel type from the US EPA EF Hub.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

466245.52

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Purchased or acquired electricity emissions are evaluated in Scope 2 consistent with GHG Protocol guidance. This methodology collects data on electricity consumption for each building used by the company. If consumption data is not available, benchmarks for electricity consumption per floor area are used as estimates. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant location-based CO2e emissions factors (EFs) for electricity generation. Renewable electricity purchases and clean energy programs are also considered. Purchased heat, steam, or cooling emissions are evaluated in Scope 2 consistent with GHG Protocol guidance. This methodology collects data on district heat, cooling, and steam consumption for each building used by the company. If consumption data is not available, benchmarks for district heat and steam consumption per floor area by country are used to estimate consumption. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant CO2e EF for heat and steam generation. Company-owned vehicle combustion emissions are evaluated as Scope 1, while company-owned electric vehicle emissions are evaluated in Scope 2. This methodology collects electricity use data or vehicle class, distance traveled, and location data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying electricity use or distance by relevant EFs, using representative data where necessary. For location-based electricity EFs we use the following sources: eGRID for the US, Canada National Inventory Report (1998-2020) for Canada, Australia National GHG Accounts Factors for Australia, IEA 2022 for all other countries, and ecoinvent 3.9.1. for each country where the grid data is not available from the aforementioned sources.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

476098.1

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Market-based method of estimating Scope 2 electricity emissions is based on the same principles as the location-based approach, the difference is in the emissions factors (EFs). For market-based electricity EFs we use these sources: supplier-specific EFs following the data hierarchy in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (Table 6.3), provided that the factors meet the Scope 2 Quality Criteria; Green-e residual EFs for the US grids, European Residual Mixes with CH4 and N2O emissions added from DEFRA for EU-based grids. Market-based EFs are default for Scope 2 electricity. Location-based EFs are used to calculate electricity emissions if no other market-based EFs are available, following the data hierarchy in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (Table 6.3).

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5178149.76

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For most purchased goods and services estimates, we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier and procurement spend data. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend with select vendors are mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the EPA EF for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis (e.g. electricity from facilities). For cloud computing emissions, we use either cloud usage data or spend data to estimate electricity consumed and calculate electricity emissions by applying regional EFs. We also use spend data to estimate the indirect emissions associated with the cloud vendor. For some physical goods where we have SKU data, BOMs are used to separate the SKU mass into individual commodities, which are multiplied by the total SKUs purchased to obtain the total mass per commodity per SKU. Mass is aggregated by each commodity to get total mass per commodity, and each commodity is mapped to the most accurate Emissions Factor(s). Emissions factors primarily come from ecoinvent and, in a few cases, publicly available scientific papers. We multiply total mass by the Emissions Factor(s) for that commodity to calculate CO2e emissions. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of cloud usage and spending. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

238486.45

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier & procurement spend data. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. Spend with select vendors is

mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when they have submitted complete reports to complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the Emissions Factor for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of cloud usage and spend. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

123908.08

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate fuel and energy related activities emissions for three categories: 1) Transmission and Distribution (T&D) - We estimate electricity lost to transmission and distribution. We apply regional grid loss rates from eGRID and Ecoinvent to estimate electricity lost in transmission and distribution, and apply the correct electricity emissions factor to estimate emissions. 2) Natural Gas Leakage - We use fugitive emissions data from chapter 4.2 of the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas inventories. A tier 1 approach was taken to evaluate fugitive emissions from exploration, production, processing, and transmission & storage of natural gas. Tier 1 was chosen as specific supply chain data was unavailable, and fugitive natural gas emissions are typically not significant for Watershed customers. 3) Upstream (well-to-tank or WTT) emissions- We calculate WTT emissions for stationary and mobile combustion, as well as WTT emissions for electricity production and electricity T&D loss. We use DEFRA EFs for WTT emissions. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based emissions in Scope 2 will also affect this category because electricity WTT and T&D loss emissions differ between the two methods. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

704368.74

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate emissions through two methods: 1) In cases where we only have spend, logistics expenses are aggregated by category to get total spend. Each logistics category is mapped to the most accurate sector category. We multiply total spend by the EF for that category. Spend-based EFs originate from Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier & procurement spend data. We exclude logistics categories that are accounted for separately. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. 2) Where we have available data on delivery distance and mass, we map the delivered goods to metric tons and multiply by distance traveled to get tonnes-km. We then choose the appropriate EF based on transportation method from EPA and DEFRA and multiply by tonnes-KM to get emissions.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

62265.05

(7.5.3) Methodological details

1) We estimate waste emissions by evaluating the number of employees working from each office location - this is assumed to match the number of employees that are actively commuting each day (see Scope 3.7). We use the CalRecycle benchmarks as an estimate for waste produced per employee per day. We multiply waste produced for each month by emissions factors for landfill and recycling. No waste estimate is included for work from home employees. We use emissions factors from DEFRA for landfill, composting, and recycling. We use emission factors from the USEPA EF Hub for landfill, composting, incineration, and digestion in the US. 2) Where waste other than employee-generated waste is expected to be relevant, we collect information on tonnage of waste disposal by waste type and treatment methods, total tonnage of waste disposal, or spend on waste disposal services.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19508.8

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate three emissions inputs for business travel. 1) Flights - We calculate the distance traveled by looking at flight routes and calculating the distance between airports. We calculate total emissions using Emissions Factors from DEFRA, grouped by category of flight (e.g. long haul, medium haul, short haul). When origin, destination, and mileage data is not available, we use spend on flights applied to the relevant EEIO emissions factor. 2) Hotels - We calculate the number of nights stayed at a hotel using the check-in and check-out dates, and apply a country specific emission factors (kg CO2e / room per night) from DEFRA. When this data is not available, we use spend on hotels applied to the relevant EEIO emissions factor. 3) For all other types of business travel (e.g. Uber, Trains), we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual spend data. Spend is aggregated by each travel category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. For all EEIO EFs, we account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

383184.2

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate emissions in two categories. 1) Commute. We estimate the number of employees commuting in each location by aggregating employees by location. We exclude any remote employees, and exclude any months where employees were working from home due to COVID-19. We use data published by governments to estimate average commute mix and distance for each location, and apply that to the total number of commuting employees in each location to determine miles traveled by car, public transit, walking and biking (Example sources: US Census Bureau for US states, Euro State for select EU cities). We multiply miles by the emissions factor for that commute-method category. For commute, we use EFs from EPA EF Hub for cars and public transit, while for walking and biking, we assume that EFs are 0. 2) Remote work. We estimate that the square footage occupied by a home office is 150 square feet. We use the Department of Energy's Building Performance Database to find benchmarks for electricity consumption per square foot of residential space and natural gas per square foot of residential space. We then multiply energy usage by the corresponding region's electricity and natural gas emissions factors. Since the DoE's data set does not assume homes are being used non-stop during working hours, we adjust these estimates up to correct for this. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category for remote work electricity usage. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate emissions from upstream leased assets in the following ways: 1) We use the same inputs as for Scope 1 and 2. Alternatively, the record of all leasing-related expenses during the measurement period, including account, currency, total spend, details (where available), vendor (where available). 2) For some leased assets such as shared co-working spaces, we have sq-ft estimates and then generate activity based EFs for electricity and natural gas then calculate emissions based on assumed activity. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of assets that utilize electricity. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

1) In cases where we only have spend, logistics expenses are aggregated by category to get total spend. Each logistics category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. We multiply total spend by the EF for that category. We exclude logistics categories that are accounted for separately. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. 2) Where we have available data on delivery distance and mass, we map the delivered goods to metric tons and multiply by distance traveled to get tonnes-km. We then choose the appropriate EF based on transportation method from EPA and DEFRA and multiply by tonnes-KM to get emissions.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5334779.71

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Direct use stage emissions are calculated for the retail products with direct electricity, fuels, and/ or refrigerants consumption, as well as sold buildings, sold vehicles, sold fuels, and sold refrigerants. For each product type, 3.11. emissions are calculated by multiplying the product lifetime energy consumption [electricity in kWh, fuels in mmBTU] or refrigerant consumption or leakage [kg of refrigerant] by the appropriate EF or GWP. Per-product emissions are multiplied by the total quantity of sold products and summed across the full product inventory. We use the same EF and GWP values as previously defined in Scope 1 and 2. We collect the data on product life time, and energy or refrigerant usage from the customer (ideally from the product LCA, if available). If such data is lacking, we use publicly available sources, including EPA's ENERGY STAR Scope 3 Use of Sold Products tool, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory's (LBL) Home Energy Saver & Score, Silicon Valley Power, EPA HFC Emissions Accounting Tool (“refrigerant model”), US Energy Information Agency energy consumption surveys. For buildings in the US, we use the Department of Energy’s Building Performance Database to energy use per building type. For buildings outside of the US, we use IEA Energy Efficiency Indicators to calculate fuel mix, which is then applied to the median fuel EUI from the BPD database. For refrigerants in buildings, we use EPA HFC accounting tool. Indirect use stage emissions are calculated for apparel by estimating energy (natural gas or electricity) needed for washing and drying throughout the lifetime of the product using the average energy consumption from the Sustainable Apparel Coalition. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity

emissions will also affect this category in the case of products that utilize electricity (that includes indirect emissions for apparel). As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1271824.5

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We calculate emissions by collecting data on SKU sold and SKU masses. SKU masses are multiplied by the number of units sold per SKU to determine the total waste produced of each SKU. Each SKU is mapped to the most accurate waste type per the waste disposal tab of the UK government greenhouse gas reporting conversion factors database. We multiply the total mass of waste by the Emissions Factor for that waste type to calculate CO2e emissions.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate emissions from downstream leased assets in the following ways: 1) Where activity data is available, we use the same inputs as for Scope 1 and 2. Alternatively, the record of all leasing-related expenses during the measurement period, including account, currency, total spend, details (where available), vendor (where available). 2) In cases where activity data is unavailable but spend is, we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual spend data. We exclude categories that are accounted for separately (i.e. buildings). We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. 3) For some leased assets such as shared co-working

spaces, we have sq-ft estimates and then generate activity based EFs for electricity and natural gas then calculate emissions based on assumed activity. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of assets that utilize electricity. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the same inputs as for Scope 1 and 2 and follow the same process as in Scope 3.8.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate the emissions from corporate investments, specifically equity and debt investments. To determine the EFs, we use the input data on the currency, country, industry, and the annual revenue of the asset for the specified measurement period. We also determine the attribution factor of the asset using the outstanding amount and the asset value. We use spend-based EFs from Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) or asset-specific EFs where available. For EEIO-based EFs, we account for inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

01/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

`Numeric input

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]
[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)

146739.62

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We include the assessment of GHGs associated with stationary combustion in company owned buildings or facilities, emissions of refrigerants, emissions of company-owned vehicles and aircrafts, as well as the backup generators. For fuel stationary combustion in buildings and facilities, we collect the data on fuel consumption for each building or shared workspace used by the company. The primary data on fuel consumption typically comes from the utility-bills and internal meter readings or landlord provided consumption. If primary activity data is not available, benchmarks for fuel consumption per floor area by building type and fuel type breakdown from Building Performance Database are applied as a secondary activity data to estimate consumption. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant CO2e emission factor (EF) for that fuel. We use US EPA and DEFRA EFs for fuel combustion. Fugitive emissions from refrigerants are measured using the purchase data on refrigerant refills. We use a conservative assumption that all refrigerant refills are due to the refrigerant leakage. If purchase data is not available, refrigerant leakage is estimated based on building floor area using EPA HFC accounting tool. Refrigerant quantities are multiplied by their 100-year GWP from IPCC. Company-owned and company-operated vehicle combustion emissions are evaluated as Scope 1, while company-owned electric vehicle emissions are evaluated in Scope 2. This methodology collects fuel use data or vehicle class, distance traveled, and location data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel use or distance by relevant emission factors coming from US EPA, DEFRA, and ecoinvent. Company-owned and company-operated aircraft emissions are calculated using flight records, aircraft make/model, and fuel consumption data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel consumed by jet fuel emission factors from the US EPA. Backup generators or other stationary sources that are not otherwise used for regular building heating result in Scope 1 combustion emissions. This methodology collects fuel use data and calculate emissions by multiplying fuel consumption by the relevant emission factors for each fuel type from the US EPA EF Hub.

Past year 1

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

204037.08

(7.6.2) End date

01/31/2024

(7.6.3) Methodological details

We include the assessment of GHGs associated with stationary combustion in company owned buildings or facilities, emissions of refrigerants, emissions of company-owned vehicles and aircrafts, as well as the backup generators. For fuel stationary combustion in buildings and facilities, we collect the data on fuel consumption for each building or shared workspace used by the company. The primary data on fuel consumption typically comes from the utility-bills and internal meter readings or landlord provided consumption. If primary activity data is not available, benchmarks for fuel consumption per floor area by building type and fuel type breakdown from Building Performance Database are applied as a secondary activity data to estimate consumption. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant CO2e emission factor (EF) for that fuel. We use US EPA and DEFRA EFs for fuel combustion. Fugitive emissions from refrigerants are measured using

the purchase data on refrigerant refills. We use a conservative assumption that all refrigerant refills are due to the refrigerant leakage. If purchase data is not available, refrigerant leakage is estimated based on building floor area using EPA HFC accounting tool. Refrigerant quantities are multiplied by their 100-year GWP from IPCC. Company-owned and company-operated vehicle combustion emissions are evaluated as Scope 1, while company-owned electric vehicle emissions are evaluated in Scope 2. This methodology collects fuel use data or vehicle class, distance traveled, and location data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel use or distance by relevant emission factors coming from US EPA, DEFRA, and ecoinvent. Company-owned and company-operated aircraft emissions are calculated using flight records, aircraft make/model, and fuel consumption data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel consumed by jet fuel emission factors from the US EPA. Backup generators or other stationary sources that are not otherwise used for regular building heating result in Scope 1 combustion emissions. This methodology collects fuel use data and calculate emissions by multiplying fuel consumption by the relevant emission factors for each fuel type from the US EPA EF Hub.
[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)

500274.54

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

529752.19

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Purchased or acquired electricity emissions are evaluated in Scope 2 consistent with GHG Protocol guidance. This methodology collects data on electricity consumption for each building used by the company. If consumption data is not available, benchmarks for electricity consumption per floor area are used as estimates. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant location-based CO2e emissions factors (EFs) for electricity generation. Renewable electricity purchases and clean energy programs are also considered. Purchased heat, steam, or cooling emissions are evaluated in Scope 2 consistent with GHG Protocol guidance. This methodology collects data on district heat, cooling, and steam consumption for each building used by the company. If consumption data is not available, benchmarks for district heat and steam consumption per floor area by country are used to estimate consumption. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant CO2e EF for heat and steam generation. Company-owned vehicle combustion emissions are evaluated as Scope 1, while company-owned electric vehicle emissions are evaluated in Scope 2. This methodology collects electricity use data or vehicle class, distance traveled, and location data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying electricity use or distance by relevant EFs, using representative data where necessary. For location-based electricity EFs we use the following sources: eGRID for the US, Canada National Inventory Report (1998-2020) for Canada, Australia National GHG Accounts Factors for Australia, IEA 2022 for all other countries, and ecoinvent 3.9.1. for each country where the grid data is not available from the aforementioned sources. Market-based method of estimating Scope 2 electricity emissions is based on the same principles as the location-based approach, the difference is in the emissions factors (EFs). For market-based

electricity EFs we use these sources: supplier-specific EFs following the data hierarchy in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (Table 6.3), provided that the factors meet the Scope 2 Quality Criteria; Green-e residual EFs for the US grids, European Residual Mixes with CH4 and N2O emissions added from DEFRA for EU-based grids. Market-based EFs are default for Scope 2 electricity. Location-based EFs are used to calculate electricity emissions if no other market-based EFs are available, following the data hierarchy in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (Table 6.3).

Past year 1

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

466245.52

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

476098.1

(7.7.3) End date

01/31/2024

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Purchased or acquired electricity emissions are evaluated in Scope 2 consistent with GHG Protocol guidance. This methodology collects data on electricity consumption for each building used by the company. If consumption data is not available, benchmarks for electricity consumption per floor area are used as estimates. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant location-based CO2e emissions factors (EFs) for electricity generation. Renewable electricity purchases and clean energy programs are also considered. Purchased heat, steam, or cooling emissions are evaluated in Scope 2 consistent with GHG Protocol guidance. This methodology collects data on district heat, cooling, and steam consumption for each building used by the company. If consumption data is not available, benchmarks for district heat and steam consumption per floor area by country are used to estimate consumption. The consumption data is then multiplied by the relevant CO2e EF for heat and steam generation. Company-owned vehicle combustion emissions are evaluated as Scope 1, while company-owned electric vehicle emissions are evaluated in Scope 2. This methodology collects electricity use data or vehicle class, distance traveled, and location data. Emissions are calculated by multiplying electricity use or distance by relevant EFs, using representative data where necessary. For location-based electricity EFs we use the following sources: eGRID for the US, Canada National Inventory Report (1998-2020) for Canada, Australia National GHG Accounts Factors for Australia, IEA 2022 for all other countries, and ecoinvent 3.9.1. for each country where the grid data is not available from the aforementioned sources. Market-based method of estimating Scope 2 electricity emissions is based on the same principles as the location-based approach, the difference is in the emissions factors (EFs). For market-based electricity EFs we use these sources: supplier-specific EFs following the data hierarchy in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (Table 6.3), provided that the factors meet the Scope 2 Quality Criteria; Green-e residual EFs for the US grids, European Residual Mixes with CH4 and N2O emissions added from DEFRA for EU-based grids. Market-based EFs are default for Scope 2 electricity. Location-based EFs are used to calculate electricity emissions if no other market-based EFs are available, following the data hierarchy in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (Table 6.3).
[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)

5694482

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Average data method

☑ Spend-based method

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

30.28

(7.8.5) Please explain

For most purchased goods and services estimates, we calculate emissions using Watershed’s CEDA database or EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier and procurement spend data. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend with select vendors are mapped to those vendors’ unique revenue intensity estimates when complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the EPA EF for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis (e.g. electricity from facilities). For cloud computing emissions, we use either cloud usage data or spend data to estimate electricity consumed and calculate electricity emissions by applying regional EFs. We also use spend data to estimate the

indirect emissions associated with the cloud vendor. For some physical goods where we have SKU data, BOMs are used to separate the SKU mass into individual commodities, which are multiplied by the total SKUs purchased to obtain the total mass per commodity per SKU. Mass is aggregated by each commodity to get total mass per commodity, and each commodity is mapped to the most accurate Emissions Factor(s). Emissions factors primarily come from ecoinvent and, in a few cases, publicly available scientific papers. We multiply total mass by the Emissions Factor(s) for that commodity to calculate CO2e emissions. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of cloud usage and spending. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

403163

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier & procurement spend data. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. Spend is aggregated by each accounting category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. Spend with select vendors is mapped to those vendors' unique revenue intensity estimates when they have submitted complete reports to complete and reported to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Total spend is multiplied by the Emissions Factor for that category or for that vendor to calculate CO2e emissions. To prevent double counting, supplier spend

data that is accounted for under alternative scopes are removed from this analysis. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of cloud usage and spend. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

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)

135322

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We estimate fuel and energy related activities emissions for three categories: 1) Transmission and Distribution (T&D) - We estimate electricity lost to transmission and distribution. We apply regional grid loss rates from eGRID and Ecoinvent to estimate electricity lost in transmission and distribution, and apply the correct electricity emissions factor to estimate emissions. 2) Natural Gas Leakage - We use fugitive emissions data from chapter 4.2 of the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas inventories. A tier 1 approach was taken to evaluate fugitive emissions from exploration, production, processing, and transmission & storage of natural gas. Tier 1 was chosen as specific supply chain data was unavailable, and fugitive natural gas emissions are typically not significant for Watershed customers. 3) Upstream (well-to-tank or WTT) emissions- We calculate WTT emissions for stationary and mobile combustion, as well as WTT emissions for electricity production and electricity T&D loss. We use DEFRA EFs for WTT emissions. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based emissions in Scope 2 will also affect this category because electricity WTT and T&D loss emissions differ between the two methods. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

877145

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based 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

We estimate emissions through two methods: 1) In cases where we only have spend, logistics expenses are aggregated by category to get total spend. Each logistics category is mapped to the most accurate sector category. We multiply total spend by the EF for that category. Spend-based EFs originate from Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual supplier & procurement spend data. We exclude logistics categories that are accounted for separately. We account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values. 2) Where we have available data on delivery distance and mass, we map the delivered goods to metric tons and multiply by distance traveled to get tonnes-km. We then choose the appropriate EF based on transportation method from EPA and DEFRA and multiply by tonnes-KM to get emissions.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

59909

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

1) We estimate waste emissions by evaluating the number of employees working from each office location - this is assumed to match the number of employees that are actively commuting each day (see Scope 3.7). We use the CalRecycle benchmarks as an estimate for waste produced per employee per day. We multiply waste produced for each month by emissions factors for landfill and recycling. No waste estimate is included for work from home employees. We use emissions factors from DEFRA for landfill, composting, and recycling. We use emission factors from the USEPA EF Hub for landfill, composting, incineration, and digestion in the US. 2) Where waste other than employee-generated waste is expected to be relevant, we collect information on tonnage of waste disposal by waste type and treatment methods, total tonnage of waste disposal, or spend on waste disposal services.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

22274

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based 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

We estimate three emissions inputs for business travel. 1) Flights - We calculate the distance traveled by looking at flight routes and calculating the distance between airports. We calculate total emissions using Emissions Factors from DEFRA, grouped by category of flight (e.g. long haul, medium haul, short haul). When origin, destination, and mileage data is not available, we use spend on flights applied to the relevant EEIO emissions factor. 2) Hotels - We calculate the number of nights stayed at a hotel using the check-in and check-out dates, and apply a country specific emission factors (kg CO2e / room per night) from DEFRA. When this data is not available, we use spend on hotels applied to the relevant EEIO emissions factor. 3) For all other types of business travel (e.g. Uber, Trains), we calculate emissions using Watershed's CEDA database or the EPA Environmentally Extended Economic Input Output (EEIO) emissions factors applied to annual spend data. Spend is aggregated by each travel category to get total spend. Each accounting category is mapped to the most accurate EEIO category. For all EEIO EFs, we account for the inflation or deflation to convert the EFs to the US dollars value for the year of the activity. We use the industry-level price index data (2012-2021 and 2022) published by the US. Bureau of Economic Analysis to get sector-specific inflation and deflation values.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

406226

(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

We estimate emissions in two categories. 1) Commute. We estimate the number of employees commuting in each location by aggregating employees by location. We exclude any remote employees, and exclude any months where employees were working from home due to COVID-19. We use data published by governments to estimate average commute mix and distance for each location, and apply that to the total number of commuting employees in each location to determine miles traveled by car, public transit, walking and biking (Example sources: US Census Bureau for US states, Euro State for select EU cities). We multiply miles by the emissions factor for that commute-method category. For commute, we use EFs from EPA EF Hub for cars and public transit, while for walking and biking, we assume that EFs are 0. 2) Remote work. We estimate that the square footage occupied by a home office is 150 square feet. We use the Department of Energy's Building Performance Database to find benchmarks for electricity consumption per square foot of residential space and natural gas per square foot of residential space. We then multiply energy usage by the corresponding region's electricity and natural gas emissions factors. Since the DoE's data set does not assume homes are being used non-stop during working hours, we adjust these estimates up to correct for this. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category for remote work electricity usage. As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Dollar Tree's leased assets are included within our scope 1 and scope 2 footprint, as we have operational control of the leased facilities. Therefore, this category of value chain emissions is not relevant for DTS.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions are not included in Dollar Tree's inventory because they are outside of our control. Once products reach our stores, there is no further transportation or distribution by third parties under our control. Emissions from customer travel to and from our stores are considered outside our control and are categorized as consumer behavior. Therefore, these downstream transportation and distribution emissions are not relevant to our carbon footprint inventory.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Dollar Tree's products are not processed, transformed or included in another product prior to being purchased by the end consumer. Therefore, this category of value chain emissions is not relevant for DTS as we do not engage in mid-stream processing of products.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

7249992

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Direct use stage emissions for the retail products with direct electricity, fuels, and/ or refrigerants consumption, as well as sold buildings, sold vehicles, sold fuels, and sold refrigerants.

☑ Methodology for indirect use phase emissions, please specify :Indirect use phase emissions for apparel

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Direct use stage emissions are calculated for the retail products with direct electricity, fuels, and/ or refrigerants consumption, as well as sold buildings, sold vehicles, sold fuels, and sold refrigerants. For each product type, 3.11. emissions are calculated by multiplying the product lifetime energy consumption [electricity in kWh, fuels in mmBTU] or refrigerant consumption or leakage [kg of refrigerant] by the appropriate EF or GWP. Per-product emissions are multiplied by the total quantity of sold products and summed across the full product inventory. We use the same EF and GWP values as previously defined in Scope 1 and 2. We collect the data on product life time, and energy or refrigerant usage from the customer (ideally from the product LCA, if available). If such data is lacking, we use publicly available sources, including EPA's ENERGY STAR Scope 3 Use of Sold Products tool, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory's (LBL) Home Energy Saver & Score, Silicon Valley Power, EPA HFC Emissions Accounting Tool ("refrigerant model"), US Energy Information Agency energy consumption surveys. For buildings in the US, we use the Department of Energy's Building Performance Database to energy use per building type. For buildings outside of the US, we use IEA Energy Efficiency Indicators to calculate fuel mix, which is then applied to the median fuel EUI from the BPD database. For refrigerants in buildings, we use EPA HFC accounting tool. Indirect use stage emissions are calculated for apparel by estimating energy (natural gas or electricity) needed for washing and drying throughout the lifetime of the product using the average energy consumption from the Sustainable Apparel Coalition. It is noteworthy that the choice of market- vs. location-based electricity emissions will also affect this category in the case of products that utilize electricity (that includes indirect emissions for apparel). As for Scope 2, market-based emissions are a default.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1381272

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We calculate emissions by collecting data on SKU sold and SKU masses. SKU masses are multiplied by the number of units sold per SKU to determine the total waste produced of each SKU. Each SKU is mapped to the most accurate waste type per the waste disposal tab of the UK government greenhouse gas reporting conversion factors database. We multiply the total mass of waste by the Emissions Factor for that waste type to calculate CO2e emissions.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Dollar Tree's assets are primarily used within its own operational framework, and the company does not typically lease these assets to external entities. Since Dollar Tree maintains direct operational control and responsibility over its assets, there are no emissions from leased assets that fall outside of its control to account for under Scope 3 Category 13.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Dollar Tree does not own any franchises; therefore, this category of value chain emissions is not relevant for Dollar Tree.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Dollar Tree is not a financial institution nor provides financial services; therefore, this category of value chain emissions is not relevant for Dollar Tree.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

01/31/2024

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

5178149.76

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

238486.45

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

123908.08

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

704368.74

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

62265.05

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

19508.8

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

383184.2

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

5334779.71

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

1271824.5
[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)

19410

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2024, we purchased 6,679 MWh of clean energy. In 2023, we purchased 55,203 MWh of clean energy. The difference is: 48,524 MWh * 0.4 tCO2e/MWh = 19,410 tCO2e In 2023, our total Scope 1 and 2 emissions were approximately 680,135 tCO_2e. With a decrease in renewable energy consumption equivalent to 19,410 tCO_2e, we calculate our increase in emissions to be 2.9%*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Energy Efficiency Initiatives: Energy Management System AI Implementation for HVAC equipment = 5,200 tCO2e decrease, and HVAC/Freezer/Cooler/Refrigerant replacements = 4,800 tCO2e decrease

Divestment

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Mergers

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Change in output

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Unidentified

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13053

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Improved data collection from refrigerant contractors, removing more conservative assumptions: 1,376 stores with primary data from contractors in 2024 vs. 663 in 2023. 13,053 tCO2e / 680,135 tCO2e = 1.9%
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ No

(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	*4720.722*	*3103.234*	*3103.234*

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
United States of America	*142018.9*	*497171.306*	*526648.959*

[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	*Emissions from stationary combustion*	*68734.91*
Row 2	*Emissions from mobile combustion*	*12986.702*
Row 3	*Emissions from fugitive emissions*	*65018.005*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By activity

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

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*District heat*	*0.007*	*0.007*
Row 2	*Electricity*	*500274.533*	*529752.186*

[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)

146739.62

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

500274.54

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

529752.19

(7.22.4) Please explain

100% of our emissions fall within the consolidated accounting group

All other entities

(7.22.4) Please explain

100% of our emissions fall within the consolidated accounting group
[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

(7.29) 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:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
	☑ 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:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

427753.93

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

427753.93

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

6679

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1383399.95

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

1390078.95

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0.02

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

0.02

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

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

0.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

6679

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1811153.9

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

1817832.90
[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:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ 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:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

54192.36

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

54134.82

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

57.54

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

373561.56

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

373561.56

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

427753.93

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

427696.39

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

57.54

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]
[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)

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

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

427696.39

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

427696.39

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

2458

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Nuclear

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

4221

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify

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

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1982

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]
[Add 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)

21641.58

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

0

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

0.02

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

17865.72

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

39507.32

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1368437.36

(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)

366784.8

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

1735222.16
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0000385119

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

676492

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

17565800000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

5

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Revenue increased by 4.7% while Scope 1 and 2 emissions decreased by 1%, mainly driven by higher energy efficiency in stores and better data for fugitive emissions. In 2024, we invested around $94 million in energy efficiency initiatives (Energy Management systems, LED lightning, HVAC upgrades, freezer upgrades, and cooler upgrades.
[Add row]

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

	Metric numerator	Metric denominator (intensity metric only)	Please explain
Row 1	*Rich text input [must be under 50 characters]*	*Rich text input [must be under 50 characters]*	*Rich text input [must be under 2400 characters]*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

06/30/2024

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

01/31/2024

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

204037

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

476098

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5178150

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

704369

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5882519.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

6562654.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

44

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

47

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2050

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

100

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

146740

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

529752

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

5694482

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

877145

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

6571627.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

7248119.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-10.44

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers Dollar Tree's operations, including stores, distribution centers, and our store support center.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Dollar Tree, Inc. announced in June 2024 its commitment to achieve science-based net-zero emissions by 2050 in support of the Paris Climate Agreement global goal. Our near-term science-based targets include: -Commit to reduce scope 1 and 2 absolute emissions by 50% by FY2032 based on a FY2023 base year (aligned with a 1.5-degree climate scenario) -Commit to have 67% of suppliers by emissions set or commit to science-based targets by FY2029

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

Our strategy focuses on energy efficiency, clean energy, waste reduction and recycling, transportation optimization, and supplier engagement. Energy Efficiency We continue to invest in upgrades that reduce both energy consumption and emissions across our stores, distribution centers, and support facilities. In 2024, we invested approximately $94 million in energy efficiency projects, including smart energy management systems, HVAC upgrades, and LED retrofits. Nearly 100% of stores are now outfitted with LED lighting and Energy Management Systems, and two additional distribution centers transitioned to full LED lighting. We also replaced 665 HVAC units with high-efficiency systems and applied our In-Store Energy Efficiency Standard to 525 new store openings. A major milestone in 2024 was the deployment of AI-driven HVAC optimization in 600 stores, saving nearly 8 million kWh of electricity, avoiding 5,632 metric tons of CO_2e emissions, and reducing costs by more than $1 million. Clean Energy We are diversifying our energy portfolio to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. In 2024, we maintained participation in community solar programs across Illinois, New York, and Maine, offsetting electricity consumption for more than 450 stores and securing 2,458 RECs. We also purchased 4,221 MWh of nuclear energy in Illinois. Looking forward, we are advancing long-term renewable energy agreements, including a Power Purchase Agreement expected to deliver 79,000 MWh of solar annually starting in 2026, a 94,185 MWh annual wind contract in Texas beginning 2027, and a 16,000 MWh annual solar contract in California beginning 2027. Waste Reduction and Recycling We achieved a 33% year-over-year increase in recycled materials,. Cardboard recycling expanded to

7,300 stores, and our Chemical and Electronics Recycling Program (CERP) diverted more than 167 tons of hazardous materials from landfill through repurposing, donation, or reclamation. Transportation and Logistics Optimization In 2024, our commitment to efficient logistics was recognized by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with a SmartWay Excellence Award Supplier Engagement We advanced our Scope 3 strategy by incorporating over 100 supplier-specific emission factors into our inventory and tracking progress toward our goal of engaging suppliers representing 67% of Scope 3 emissions. By the end of 2024, 12.7% of suppliers in high-impact categories had established or committed to emission reduction targets.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other climate-related targets

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
To be implemented	*6*	*104804*
Implementation commenced	*7*	*66135*
Implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*
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

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

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

31640

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1103455

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In late 2023, we entered into an agreement to purchase new renewable energy on the grid, also called a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA), which will be operational in 2026. This PPA, which we procured through a retail supply agreement with Constellation, will enable the provision of 79k MWh of renewable energy to approximately 700 stores in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Wind

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

37674

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(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

In recent months, we strengthened our portfolio with two new retail energy agreements: • Texas: A contract to procure 94,185 MWh of wind energy annually beginning in June 2027. • California: A contract to supply 16,000 MWh of solar energy annually beginning in January 2027. These projects support emissions reduction and energy cost stability without requiring significant capital investments.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Solar PV

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

6400

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(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

In recent months, we strengthened our portfolio with two new retail energy agreements: 1. Texas: A contract to procure 94,185 MWh of wind energy annually beginning in June 2027. 2. California: A contract to supply 16,000 MWh of solar energy annually beginning in January 2027. These projects support emissions reduction and energy cost stability without requiring significant capital investments.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity

☑ Waste reduction

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

28216

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2024, Dollar Tree made meaningful progress in reducing our environmental impact through enhanced recycling and waste diversion initiatives. We increased total recycled waste by 33% year-over-year, resulting in the recovery of approximately 285,000 tons of material. Our overall waste diversion rate reached 63.4%, underscoring our ongoing commitment to minimizing landfill waste and recovering valuable resources across our operations. A key contributor to this improvement was our investment in in-store recycling infrastructure. In 2024, 7,300 Dollar Tree stores actively participated in corrugated cardboard recycling, enabling a significant increase in recovered materials and reducing the environmental footprint of our store operations.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Other, please specify :Improving route efficiency in Transportation

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

124

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

500000

(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:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Removing routing restrictions to improve efficiency and reduce miles traveled

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Other, please specify :Splitting store deliveries to reduce mileage

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

750

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

377125

(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:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Splitting store deliveries to reduce mileage

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

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

5328

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1739897

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

36666000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 21-25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

HVAC Upgrades

Row 8

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

☑ Resource efficiency

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

2890

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

7008808

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

43353000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Replace freezer and cooler doors

Row 9

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change
☑ Resource efficiency

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

26088

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

4763803

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Energy Management System Artificial Intelligence Initiative

Row 10

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Other, please specify :Increasing use of rail transportation

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

4252

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3176947

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Increasing use of rail transportation

Row 11

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Other, please specify :Increasing trailer utilization

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

777

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

933796

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Increasing trailer utilization

Row 12

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Fugitive emissions reductions
☑ Refrigerant leakage reduction

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

1381

(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

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Refrigerant replacement

Row 13

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Other, please specify :Prioritizing Fuel Efficient carriers

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

25419

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Rich text input [must be under 1500 characters]
[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 energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The Board of Directors reviews and approves the company's annual budget, which includes a budget for energy efficiency and climate risk mitigation efforts. The prioritization of these efforts is influenced by increased efficiencies and lower costs
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Volume type
Timber products	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced
Palm oil	*Select all that apply* ☑ Sourced

[Fixed row]

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Timber products

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Unknown origin

Palm oil

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:
☑ Unknown origin
[Add row]

(8.6) Does your organization produce or source palm oil derived biofuel?

Select from:
☑ No

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Timber products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year

Not an immediate strategic priority

Palm oil

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year

We do not have active targets, but we do have a Palm Oil Policy, which states the following: Dollar Tree is committed to ensuring that the palm oil, palm kernel oil, and palm oil derivatives contained in our private label and national brand products is procured in a responsible and sustainable manner. In addition to the standards outlined below, we also require that our suppliers comply with the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil certification standards or equivalent best practices. Our policy calls for our suppliers to ensure they are procuring palm oil in a manner that supports deforestation-free production of palm oil that includes the protection of all natural forests. This includes but is not limited to primary forests, secondary forests, High Conservation Value forests, High Carbon Stock forests from the conversion due to expansion of existing plantations or new plantation development. We require that suppliers adhere to the principles outlined below and create transparency and traceability along the palm oil supply chain to the plantation. • Must originate from growers that protect peatlands of any depth from new plantation development and if sourcing from plantations previously planted on peatland, adhere to best management practices that are at least as strong as those outlined by the RSPO; • Adhere to a strict no burning policy; • Must originate from growers that comply with all relevant local, national, and international laws as per our operating guidelines; • Must originate from growers that track and report on the total carbon footprint for their production; and • Must abide by our operating guidelines to ensure a conflict-free workplace that protects the rights of workers and indigenous communities.
[Fixed row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

	Traceability system	Primary reason your organization does not have a traceability system	Explain why your organization does not have a traceability system
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to establish one within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority*
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to establish one within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority*

[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Timber products

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

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

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:
☑ No

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

Not an immediate strategic priority

Palm oil

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

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

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?

Select from:

☑ No

(8.9.7) Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.9.8) Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status

Not an immediate strategic priority
[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint	Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint	Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority*
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority*

[Fixed row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years
Palm oil	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

	Assess legal compliance with forest regulations	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Not an immediate strategic priority*

[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Not an immediate strategic priority
[Fixed row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:

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

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to implement project(s) within the next two years

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ No

(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:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Metered Volume from utility bills

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawals and associated sewer charges for our Stores and Distribution Centers are based on the metered volume shown on our monthly utility bills

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Metered Volume from utility bills

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water use and associated sewer charges for our Stores and Distribution Centers are based on the metered volume shown on our monthly utility bills

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

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

(9.2.4) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]
[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)

3817.26

(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:
☑ Other, please specify :Divestiture of the Family Dollar business

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Not forecasted

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

3294.95

(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:
☑ Other, please specify :Divestiture of the Family Dollar business

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Not forecasted

Total consumption

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Rich text input [must be under 2000 characters]
[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.

	Withdrawals are from areas with water stress	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ Unknown	*Unknown*

[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	*Select from:* ☑ 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	*We have not performed this assessment*

	Identification of facilities in the value chain stage	Please explain
Upstream value chain	*Select from:* ☑ 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	*We have not performed this assessment*

[Fixed row]

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

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	17565800000	*4601677.64*	*Unknown*

[Fixed row]

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

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Please explain
Row 1	*Unknown*

[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

	Products and/or services classified as low water impact	Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Important but not an immediate business priority	*Important but not an immediate business priority*

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?

(9.15.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

We continue to build our sustainability strategy & prioritization process. If water related issues are identified as priority topics, we will develop targets and initiatives accordingly.
[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

☑ Law & policy

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party	Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party	Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*We will verify our GHG disclosure in 2026 to comply with Climate Disclosure regulations in California*

[Fixed row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information
	Rich text input [must be under 10000 characters]

[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

SVP Chief Sustainability and Corporate Affairs Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:
☑ No