Vina Concha y Toro S A

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

.

08/12/2026, 02:12 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

include Viña Cono Sur, Viña Maipo, Palo Alto, Canepa, Maycas del Limarí, and Viña Almaviva. It also has production operations in Argentina and the United States through its subsidiaries Trivento Bodegas y Viñedos and Bonterra Organic Vineyards, respectively. The Company's business strategy aims to achieve sustained growth in sales, market participation and share. To that effect, the Company has worked on a vertically-integrated production model that focuses exclusively on wine: from the origin in the vineyard to its commercialization. To achieve this significant investments have been made: in vineyards, wineries, modern plants, and recently in sales, participating directly in the distribution stage within several key markets. Viña Concha y Toro has been part of the avant-garde in the Chilean wine industry and has positioned itself as a world-class wine company. To maintain this leadership, and a production chain in line with its long-term vision, the Company has embedded sustainability as part of its core philosophy and a strategic element in its business.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2024

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 2 years

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

Select from:

☑ 2 years

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

Select from:

☑ 2 years

[Fixed row]

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

966243956

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ 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

☑ Argentina

☑ Chile

☑ United States of America

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for all facilities

(1.8.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro provides geolocation (latitude/longitude) for all production facilities and links each site to its corresponding river basin; this dataset is kept up to date and used for basin-level water-risk screening.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Limari

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.6946

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.2382

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Nueva Aurora

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.6895

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.2365

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Nueva Aurora

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.692471

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.236961

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Acacios

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.697195

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.291828

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo San Julian

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.662594

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.349725

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Trapiche

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.622772

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.307964

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Quebrada Seca

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.529348

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.449842

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo La Chica

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.692471

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.236961

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo La Granja

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-30.739549

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.336632

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Triangulo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.37118

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.308136

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Perales

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.287203

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.310711

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Campo Lindo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.568331

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.376498

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Encanto

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-32.711306

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.616544

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Don Melchor

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.608258

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.612785

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Planta Vespucio

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.3938

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.7698

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Tocornal

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.605

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.6264

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Puente Alto

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.605

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.6264

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo La Protectora

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.596033

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.597801

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Mariscal

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.596033

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.597801

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo San Adolfo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.638561

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.655394

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Pirque

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.635846

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.580163

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Planta Pirque

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.6355

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.5741

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 23

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Santa Isabel

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.671277

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.545192

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 24

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Quinta Maipo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.734369

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.787837

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Requinoa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.331949

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.784169

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Rucahue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.608258

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-70.612785

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 27

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Idahue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.48967

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.202733

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 28

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Peumo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.364331

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.197693

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 29

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Peumo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.364331

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.197693

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Las Pataguas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.344623

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.339142

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 31

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Llallauquén

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.257889

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.420028

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 32

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Durazno

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.188972

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.339917

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Ucúquer

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.001526

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.70865

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Agua Santa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.425479

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.495601

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 35

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Palo Santo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.427903

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.596227

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 36

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo La Puerta

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.600998

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.414008

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Estero

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.651378

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.151543

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 38

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Chomedahue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.665069

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.340316

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 39

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Pumanque

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.550998

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.643714

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 40

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Las Mercedes

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.801117

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.684589

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 41

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Lolol

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.8015

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.6855

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 42

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Peralillo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.4283

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.5002

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Las Lomas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.437966

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.477713

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Nilahue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.698204

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.770234

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Quiahue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.791894

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.710165

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Rauco

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.884705

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.321072

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 47

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo San Manuel

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.886776

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.251745

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 48

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo San Ignacio

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.078319

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.262699

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 49

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Yungay

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.093507

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.229987

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 50

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Santa Elisa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.711235

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.039324

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Santa Elisa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.711235

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.039324

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo San Rafael

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.717961

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.004101

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 53

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Chimbarongo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.7164

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.0385

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 54

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Curico

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.9852

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.2501

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 55

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Lontue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.0612

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.2715

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 56

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Mirador

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.193871

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.194839

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 57

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Casa Viejas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.31679

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.223342

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 58

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Lourdes

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.446468

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.80553

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 59

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo La Espuela

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.47349

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.458808

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 60

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Lourdes

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.446468

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.80553

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 61

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Santa Raquel

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.360566

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.774883

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 62

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Quebrada de Agua

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.093507

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.229987

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 63

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Mariposas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.529432

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.450014

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 64

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega San Javier

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.6121

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.7324

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 65

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Villa Alegre

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.617954

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.842775

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 66

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo El Boldo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.977867

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.246815

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 67

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Keule

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.863381

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.050173

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 68

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Mulchen

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-37.75392

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-72.299749

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile

Row 69

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Maipu

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.020535

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.773831

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 70

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Vientos

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.020569

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.772194

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 71

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Cruz del Alto

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.263353

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.962537

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 72

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Las Cumbres

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.142816

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.951688

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 73

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Eolo

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.020535

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.773831

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 74

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Tierras Negras

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.01683

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.77215

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 75

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Fraccionamiento Maipú

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.020535

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.773831

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 76

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Drummond

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.02017

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.87241

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 77

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Finca Drummond

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.02017

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.87241

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 78

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Tres Porteñas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-32.891562

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.374386

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 79

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Tres Porteñas

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-32.891891

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.371267

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 80

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Portones

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.264681

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.446354

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 81

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Zorros

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.285516

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.420374

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 82

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Olivos

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.111019

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-68.534474

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 83

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Indios

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.79895

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-69.160122

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 84

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Sauces

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.579566

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-69.211653

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 85

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Los Ponchos

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-33.444674

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-69.195981

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Argentina

Row 86

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Anthony's Hill

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.99987

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.107771

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 87

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Blue Heron

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.98829

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.10158

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 88

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Butler

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.06665

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.201759

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 89

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Chalfont

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.09585

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.16797

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 90

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Cooperage Creek/Los Cerros

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.985261

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.099142

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 91

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Dooley Creek

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.972429

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.102743

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 92

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Ledford

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.097587

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.163605

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 93

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo McNab

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.04106

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.186098

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 94

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Sundial

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.001316

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.108112

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 95

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Hooper

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.965272

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.041929

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 96

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fundo Jekel

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.29255

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-121.30969

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 97

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bodega Bonterra Organic Estates

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.989527

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.097505

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 98

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Planta Bonterra Organic Estates

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.989527

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-123.097505

(1.8.1.4) Comment

United States

Row 99

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Planta Lontue

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-35.0612

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-71.2715

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Chile
[Add row]

(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure?

Production

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Value chain (including own land)

Processing/ Manufacturing

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Distribution

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:
☑ Both direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Consumption

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

☑ No

(1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

The main nature of our products is alcoholic beverages, and within that category our main product is wine. Typically, wine does not require special storage at the consumer level and is meant to be consumed directly (it is a final product that does not need processing), which drastically reduces emissions at this stage of the product life cycle; water use is not material.
[Fixed row]

(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?

Cattle products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Cocoa

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ No

Coffee

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Palm oil

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Soy

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Timber products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:
☑ No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☑ Produced and sourced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

All Viña Concha y Toro products rely on grapes. More specifically, 95% of the company's income depends on this commodity; the remaining 5% comes from other business activities. In 2024, 35% of grapes used in our products are sourced from external suppliers, and Concha y Toro produces 65%.
[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

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Viña Concha y Toro maps its value chain across upstream and downstream stages. Our main supplier categories are grape growers, glass bottles, corks, labels and cartons. No single supplier accounts for 10% or more of total purchases in the period. We map suppliers using our procurement systems and supplier registers and classify them with defined criteria (e.g., spend, category, business criticality and ESG screening) to guide engagement. In line with our Sustainability Strategy, we continue to implement the Responsible Sourcing Program based on two components: (i) human-rights and business-ethics standards; and (ii) climate change with a focus on packaging suppliers. We aim to have the program 100% implemented by 2025 and are engaging 27 key packaging suppliers to advance more sustainable, lower-carbon packaging.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

Within our operations and product manufacturing, plastics are used only in minor quantities—our primary packaging is glass bottles. Plastics are addressed within our Circular Innovation strategy, under which we are mapping plastic flows and end-of-life pathways across our value chain and will complete this work by 2025, prioritizing our 10 main waste categories and upcycling alternatives.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

The corporate sustainability plan “Uncork a Better Future” (2020–2025) is managed through annual targets per pillar. These targets are embedded in the annual budget process, driving near-term investments (e.g., operational efficiency, water stewardship actions and data/verification improvements) to deliver the plan by 2025.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

6

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

We carry out a combined climate and water risk-and-opportunity assessment with a medium-to-long-term lens. The outputs feed 3–5-year plans (capex/opex) covering operational efficiency, adaptation in water-stressed basins, energy and supply-chain levers. This informs resource allocation, sequencing of initiatives and financing options.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Our long-term horizon is aligned with Net Zero 2040, supported by intermediate milestones. Long-term planning guides technology choices, vineyard/asset strategy and supplier engagement, and is reflected in multi-year capex frameworks used for project screening and investment decisions.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD

☑ TNFD – Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures

☑ Water Footprint Network Assessment tool

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
☑ ISO 31000 Risk Management Standard

International methodologies and standards
☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections
☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard
☑ Life Cycle Assessment

Other
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Desk-based research
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Internal company methods
☑ Jurisdictional/landscape assessment
☑ Source Water Vulnerability Assessment

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

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

Chronic physical
☑ Heat stress
☑ Soil erosion
☑ Water stress
☑ Soil degradation
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit

☑ Increased pricing of water

☑ Limited or lack of river basin management

☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Limited access to soil conservation and other sustainable techniques

☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Local communities

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Viña Concha y Toro manages environmental risks and opportunities through a Risk Management System aligned with ISO 31000 and COSO 2013, integrated with site-level ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems. The process covers direct operations and material stages of the value chain; for water, assessments are performed at river-basin/catchment level using recognized tools to prioritize higher-stress basins. Assessments are annual, with interim reviews, plus a biennial top-down review for strategic risks and opportunities. We consider physical (acute/chronic) and transition risks, score them by likelihood and impact, and prioritize them in a corporate risk matrix; non-strategic items remain in the operational risk register. Results inform our strategy, the budget and multi-year capex/opex plans; mitigation/adaptation plans are managed through KPIs and performance reviews. Governance is exercised at Board level through the Ethics & Sustainability Committee (Board-level) and the Audit Committee. At the executive level, the Sustainability Committee, chaired by the CEO, reviews progress regularly and escalates to the Board on a quarterly basis; monthly updates are provided on climate matters. The Sustainability function (CSO) coordinates methodology and metrics, reports to the CFO, and escalates progress to the Sustainability Committee and the Board. For impacts, the process is complemented by a life-cycle approach (selective LCA) and end-of-life pathways to reduce externalities and unlock opportunities with suppliers and customers. Where relevant, we apply scenario analysis for key sites/markets and embed findings into planning and investment decisions.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

We explicitly assess the interconnections between climate, water and nature as part of our integrated risk process. At river-basin level we map our dependencies (water availability and quality, ecosystem services such as water supply and soil retention) and our impacts (abstraction, discharge, land use/management). We then overlay physical climate hazards (e.g., drought/heatwaves, extreme rainfall) and regulatory/market drivers to understand how changes in climate can alter those ecosystem services and, in turn, our operational risks and opportunities. In 2024 we completed the first stage of a TNFD-aligned nature-related screening, which added biodiversity risks (e.g., habitat/land-use change, soil erosion, agrochemical use) that are closely linked to water and climate. Outputs are consolidated in the

corporate risk register and used to prioritize actions and avoid trade-offs—for example: irrigation efficiency and drought contingency (water–climate), erosion control and soil/habitat management (water–biodiversity), and supplier programmes—while assessing and managing potential trade-offs to avoid burden-shifting (e.g., water-saving measures that could increase energy or chemical intensity).
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

☑ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We apply an annual two-tier geospatial screening across our direct operations: (1) Water-stressed basins. Sites located in river basins with High or greater baseline water stress (WRI Aqueduct) and/or high composite water risk; basins with high flood hazard and/or poor water quality are also included. The list is refreshed yearly to reflect changes in basin risk. (2) Biodiversity sensitivity. A TNFD-aligned (Locate) GIS screening (ArcGIS) that scores and ranks each site against nature attributes (e.g., habitat condition, soil/erosion risk, and overlap/proximity to legally protected or native ecosystems). 100% of company land is mapped, and native-forest areas are managed under FSC-verified plans. Outputs are stored in a geospatial register and reviewed annually to prioritise actions in these priority locations (e.g., water-stewardship measures in high-stress basins and habitat/soil management near sensitive areas).

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

7628865

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Substantive effect (risk) is triggered when the expected impact is ≥5% decrease in EBITDA or ≥2 days of loss of operational continuity at production plants/warehouses/hubs (High). A Very High effect is ≥7% decrease in EBITDA or >7 days of loss of continuity. Likelihood is rated on a five-level scale and combined with the time horizon to prioritise actions.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

9662440

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Substantive effect (opportunity) is triggered when the expected impact is ≥1% increase in revenue attributable to the development of new vineyards in suitable areas, enabled by adaptation measures. Estimates are based on projected annual production from ~200 ha of new vineyards and average selling prices, including capex/opex for land acquisition and vineyard establishment.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:
☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

Viña Concha y Toro identifies and manages potential water pollutants across vineyards, wineries, bottling and logistics. At site level, each facility maintains a pollutants register based on SDS/GHS information, applicable permits and destination-market requirements. Substances and waste streams are classified by hazard, pathway (effluent, storm-water, runoff/leaching) and receiving-basin sensitivity, with corresponding controls and monitoring. The pollutant classes most relevant to our sector include organic load and suspended solids (BOD/COD), nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) from fertilisers and winery wastewater, pH/cleaning agents and surfactants from CIP operations, crop-protection products and fertilisers (including copper-based) and their metabolites in runoff/leachate, and hydrocarbons/metals from fuel/maintenance and material handling. Controls include a Restricted/Substances List (banned/restricted actives), integrated pest management and calibrated applications, weather-window planning, buffer strips and soil cover, secondary containment and spill kits for storage/transfer, separation and recovery of winery residues, and on-site wastewater treatment prior to discharge or reuse. Compliance is verified through periodic monitoring against legal and buyer limits, internal inspections and audits, and external audits; the register is reviewed at least annually and whenever new substances or processes are introduced. Our Sustainability Principles require compliance with environmental laws in all countries where we operate; site environmental management systems are aligned with ISO 14001 and some sites hold ISO 14001 certification. Growers receive technical support and training to implement these requirements across our supply chain.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Pesticides

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Irrigation and rainfall can mobilize crop-protection products to soils and groundwater in company vineyards and supplier farms. While typical concentrations are below acute toxicity levels, there is a risk of chronic exposure via drinking-water pathways and impacts on sensitive habitats if not properly managed.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Other, please specify :Pesticide management, substitution of pesticides for less toxic or environmentally hazardous alternatives, and follow regulation standards

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Across all countries of operation, the Company applies an industry sustainability code that defines permitted active substances and application practices to avoid contamination of soils, water bodies and conservation areas. Controls include an internal Restricted/Substances List (RSL), integrated pest management, calibrated equipment and weather-window planning, plus buffer strips and soil cover to reduce runoff, and secondary containment for storage/transfer. Suppliers are required to comply and are audited. Success is measured through compliance with internal and external requirements; all vineyards hold sustainability certification subject to audits, and no fines have been received related to this impact.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Nitrates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Nitrogen fertilizer use can lead to nitrate leaching to groundwater and runoff to surface waters, increasing the risk of eutrophication if not managed.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Other, please specify :Nutrient budgeting (soil/leaf analyses), controlled fertigation, split doses, timing to avoid rainfall, vegetative buffer strips

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The Company applies nutrient budgeting based on soil and leaf analyses, controlled fertigation, split dosing and well-timed applications to avoid rainfall events, together with vegetative buffer strips to reduce runoff. These practices are implemented at Company vineyards and promoted with growers. Performance is evaluated through regulatory compliance and internal agronomic monitoring.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Phosphorus attaches to soil particles and reaches water bodies through erosion and runoff, increasing eutrophication risk.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Other, please specify :Soil cover and contour practices, buffer strips, calibrated/timed fertilisation, erosion control

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

To limit phosphorus losses, the Company prevents erosion through soil cover and contour practices, maintains buffer strips, and applies calibrated, well-timed fertilisation. These measures are implemented at Company vineyards and promoted with growers. Performance is verified through erosion-control checks and regulatory compliance.

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Winemaking generates organic load (BOD/COD) and suspended solids from must/wine residues and cleaning (CIP) streams; without treatment, these can raise BOD/COD and contribute to eutrophication and oxygen depletion.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Water recycling

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Other, please specify :Waste water management and follow regulation standards

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The Liquid Industrial Waste team manages winery wastewater through on-site treatment and process optimisation. In Chile, the Company operates five treatment plants under permits and monitoring; where a site has no plant, wastewater is stabilised in dams for later irrigation or sent to specialised external providers for treatment and disposal in line with regulation. Advanced solutions have been implemented, including a membrane bioreactor (MBR) and, at Fetzer (USA), a BioFiltro BIDA system that reduces energy use and generates soil-enriching castings. Success is measured by compliance with discharge limits, periodic monitoring and completion of improvement projects; no fines have been received related to this impact.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.1.3) Please explain

Within the Company's operations and product manufacturing, plastics are used in limited quantities because packaging is primarily glass bottles. Usage is mostly confined to closures, labels, and logistics films (e.g., shrink/stretch wrap). Despite this low materiality, plastics are addressed under the Circular Innovation strategy: the Company is mapping its 10 main waste categories and identifying reuse/upcycling alternatives by 2025.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy
☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Argentina
☑ Chile
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Chile's Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) law allocates end-of-life costs to producers and sets rising collection/recovery targets for packaging placed on the domestic market. For the Company, this primarily affects glass bottles, cardboard cases and ancillary packaging. Tightening targets and fee schedules may increase operating costs (eco-design/lightweighting, labeling and reporting, PRO/management fees, and data systems) and require coordination with suppliers and distributors to ensure end-of-life management.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Increased operational costs due to non-compliance with local regulations or environmental fines.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

6100000

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

7800000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimated based on packaging placed on the Chilean market by material and the Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO) fee schedules. Method: tonnes by material x fee per tonne + internal administration and reporting costs + incremental eco-design/lightweighting spend where applicable. Figures are updated annually in line with PRO fee schedules and verified placed-on-market data.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Other engagement, please specify :Engage in sectoral working groups

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1300000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Benchmark of operating costs in EPR-implemented markets (e.g., Spain, Belgium, Germany): membership/administration fees to PRO + internal data/reporting resources + incremental eco-design/lightweighting spend.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The Company participates in sectoral working groups on EPR and aligns with a Producer Responsibility Organization to finance and organize packaging end-of-life. It prepares budgets based on expected fee schedules and strengthens placed-on-market data systems for reporting. Operational measures include packaging eco-design and lightweighting (including alignment to the SWR bottle weight accord, targeting an average 420 g for 750 ml), pilots of Wrap Around secondary boxes that

can reduce about 40 g of cardboard per case with potential to exceed 1000 t per year if fully deployed, and an updated packaging life-cycle assessment to guide material and format choices. In parallel, the Company runs collection pilots with CENEM to engage end users and improve recovery rates.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Mataquito

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Grape suppliers operating in water-stressed basins face lower and more variable surface and groundwater availability, as well as more frequent out-of-season or extreme events. This can reduce yields and quality, raise sourcing prices, and create a risk of supply disruption for purchased grapes. Stress levels are expected to remain high over the next 3–5 years, requiring closer supplier engagement and contingency sourcing.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption to sales

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Potential revenue impact from reduced volumes and mix, and higher procurement costs due to price increases from suppliers or alternative sourcing from less-stressed regions.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

931935

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

1863871

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Problems in sourcing grapes of sufficient quantity, quality and price could affect our production volume, impacting on our revenues and, potentially, affecting our reputation if it impacts our ability to fulfil commercial expectations. The potential financial impact figure is based on the estimated sales value of product that relies on the purchase of grapes from suppliers in this water basin.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Promotion of best practice and awareness in the value chain

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

19281

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This estimate is based on 2019 expenditure (approx. USD15,000) on advisory services for our providers, supporting them to achieve certification for compliance with the Chilean National Sustainability Code for wine. In addition to expenditure on technical support offered to suppliers on winery management best practice, including water management. Our company covers all associated costs.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Viña Concha y Toro offers its providers technical support in vineyard management best practice, including water management. Additionally, we work with the Chilean National Sustainability Code for wine particularly with long term suppliers. This Code requires suppliers to implement practices including: water management plans, irrigation plans, water quality analysis (biological & chemical), streamflow measurements, and irrigation infrastructure maintenance. During 2016, 28% of suppliers were certified under the Chilean Wine Sustainability Code. Viña Concha y Toro works alongside INDAP (Institute of Agricultural Development) developing technical proposals for productive partners. These proposals align with the following objectives: 1) to increase productivity of the vineyards, through technical guidance of

producers in tasks such as pruning, irrigation and pest control; 2) to adopt good agricultural practices on the premises, guiding the producer in the implementation of these with the ultimate goal of achieving certification; 3) to improve land management control, through the design and implementation of records of traceability, costs of property, and other activities; 4) to improve familiarity with technology and computing tools, seeking to strengthen good practice through maintaining computer records and tracking time. As part of our 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we have established the overaching target of reducing the water intensity of our product (consumption per bottle) by 10% (compared to 2020); a target that considers the footprint of both own and purchased grape (suppliers). This target guides water efficiency action at then operational level, enabling us to manage our exposure to water stress related risks at sites such as this.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

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

(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

☑ Chile

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Extreme events and changing weather patterns can damage crops or make essential resources (such as water) less available, therefore impacting harvest and production. The change in precipitation patterns that is projected in Global Climate Model scenarios for our regions of operation, will compound the risk of water scarcity as well as flooding in our operations. We have already experienced production disruptions due to lack of water in the north of Chile. Currently, more than 50%

of Viña Concha y Toro's water extraction is at sites that are located in water-stressed areas and this is expected to increase over the next 3-5 years as additional zones become affected by this hazard.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Potential revenue decline from yield losses and quality downgrades, plus higher operating costs linked to harvesting/processing under adverse conditions and contingency logistics.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

870000

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

2600000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimated as: tonnes of production at risk due to weather variability x gross margin per tonne (or per 9L equivalent), plus incremental operating and logistics costs (e.g., overtime, temporary protection, pumping and processing under adverse conditions). Ranges reflect variability in yield impacts and quality downgrades across affected sites.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2600000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The indicated cost of our response strategy relates to the staff-hours and infrastructure required to undertake the activities described - replacement of irrigation technology and staff training. This figure is based on previously implemented activities for which costs are available.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Implement climate-adaptation practices across vineyards and wineries: precision irrigation and monitoring (weather stations, soil-moisture probes, pressure chamber/Scholander), remote irrigation control and leak detection, and updated irrigation plans per block. Strengthen frost/hail protection and harvest scheduling, expanding rapid mechanized harvesting capacity to shorten exposure windows during adverse events. Improve drainage and runoff management around critical sites and access roads; adjust winemaking SOPs for wet/heat scenarios (cold chain, pumping/pressing under rain events, overtime/contingency shifts). Deploy early-warning protocols and incident playbooks, plus staff training on climate and water management. These measures reduce yield losses, quality downgrades, and operational downtime at affected sites in Chile and the United States.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Argentina

☑ Chile

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Future expansions of carbon pricing and related import requirements in key markets (e.g., EU emissions tariffs/labels, energy performance rules for wineries and buildings) could impose additional compliance costs on non-EU producers. Given the EU's relevance for the Company, and growing interest in North America regarding product emissions information, these measures could translate into operating cost increases and potential barriers to market access.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Reduced sales or loss of sales to the EU as a result of the implementation of emissions tariffs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

4340000

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

8940000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

This financial impact is an estimate of the reduced sales or loss of sales to the EU as a result of the implementation of emissions tariffs, and potential increased costs of compliance with the described import conditions. The potential financial impact also will depend on the extent of taxation increases and/or carbon taxes.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

8700000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The first step for the 2020-2025 period consists of the electrification of its equipment (mainly boilers, trucks, frost control towers and forklifts) that currently use LPG. The estimated cost of this technology change amounts to over US 8 million, the cost reported above. The company has taken measures such as changing the kinds of fuels used in our processes, developing renewable energy projects and improving our equipment and technology to increase energy efficiency.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Advance decarbonization to mitigate exposure to carbon pricing: maintain 100% renewable electricity (on-site solar, renewable purchases and I-RECs); electrify fossil-fuel equipment (e.g., boilers, forklifts, frost-control towers); and implement energy-efficiency upgrades. Use annual carbon footprinting and product life-cycle assessment to target high-impact actions and prioritize investments; prepare product emissions disclosures/labels as required by destination markets.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Limari

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our grape suppliers located in Limarí are in a water stressed river basin which means that there is already an elevated risk of insufficient availability of water for their operations, and the analysis of the WRI Aqueduct tool indicates that this is expected to increase in the future. In 2024, 35% of grapes processed by Viña Concha y Toro were purchased from suppliers. A decrease in water availability could result in a lesser quality, lower grape yield, additional water supply costs and/or higher prices to buy our grape supplier. These are costs that in turn may have to be passed on to customers.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption to sales

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Decreased in production and sales due to water stressed impacted grape suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

931935

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

1863871

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Problems in sourcing grapes of sufficient quantity, quality and price could affect our production volume, impacting on our revenues and, potentially, affecting our reputation if it impacts our ability to fulfil commercial expectations. The potential financial impact figure is based on the estimated sales value of product that relies on the purchase of grapes from suppliers in this water basin.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Promotion of best practice and awareness in the value chain

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

19281

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This estimate is based on 2019 expenditure (approx. USD15,000) on advisory services for our providers, supporting them to achieve certification for compliance with the Chilean National Sustainability Code for wine. In addition to expenditure on technical support offered to suppliers on winery management best practice, including water management. Our company covers all associated costs.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Viña Concha y Toro offers its providers technical support in vineyard management best practice, including water management. Additionally, we work with the Chilean National Sustainability Code for wine particularly with long term suppliers. This Code requires suppliers to implement practices including: water management plans, irrigation plans, water quality analysis (biological & chemical), streamflow measurements, and irrigation infrastructure maintenance. During 2016, 28% of suppliers were certified under the Chilean Wine Sustainability Code. Viña Concha y Toro works alongside INDAP (Institute of Agricultural Development) developing technical proposals for productive partners. These proposals align with the following objectives: 1) to increase productivity of the vineyards, through technical guidance of producers in tasks such as pruning, irrigation and pest control; 2) to adopt good agricultural practices on the premises, guiding the producer in the implementation of these with the ultimate goal of achieving certification; 3) to improve land management control, through the design and implementation of records of traceability, costs of property, and other activities; 4) to improve familiarity with technology and computing tools, seeking to strengthen good practice through maintaining computer records and tracking time. As part of our 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we have established the overaching target of reducing the water intensity of our product (consumption per bottle) by 10% (compared to 2020); a target that considers the footprint of both own and purchased grape (suppliers). This target guides water efficiency action at then operational level, enabling us to manage our exposure to water stress related risks at sites such as this.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Casablanca

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our grape suppliers located in Casablanca are in a water stressed river basin which means that there is already an elevated risk of insufficient availability of water for their operations, and the analysis of the WRI Aqueduct tool indicates that this is expected to increase in the future. In 2024, 35% of grapes processed by Viña Concha y Toro were purchased from suppliers. A decrease in water availability could result in a lesser quality, lower grape yield, additional water supply costs and/or higher prices to buy our grape supplier. These are costs that in turn may have to be passed on to customers.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption to sales

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Decreased in production and sales due to water stressed impacted grape suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

557019

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

1114038

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Problems in sourcing grapes of sufficient quantity, quality and price could affect our production volume, impacting on our revenues and, potentially, affecting our reputation if it impacts our ability to fulfil commercial expectations. The potential financial impact figure is based on the estimated sales value of product that relies on the purchase of grapes from suppliers in this water basin.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Promotion of best practice and awareness in the value chain

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

19281

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This estimate is based on 2019 expenditure (approx. USD15,000) in advisory services for our providers, supporting them to achieve certification for compliance with the National Sustainability Code for the Chilean wine industry. In addition to expenditure on technical support offered to suppliers on winery management best practice, including water management. Our company covers all associated costs.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Viña Concha y Toro offers its providers technical support in vineyard management best practice, including water management. Additionally, we work with the National Sustainability Code for the Chilean wine industry, particularly with long term suppliers. This Code requires suppliers to implement practices including: water management plans, irrigation plans, water quality analysis (biological & chemical), streamflow measurements, and irrigation infrastructure maintenance. During 2016, 28% of suppliers were certified under the National Sustainability Code for the Chilean wine industry. Viña Concha y Toro works alongside INDAP (Institute of Agricultural Development) developing technical proposals for productive partners. These proposals align with the following objectives: 1) to increase productivity of the vineyards, through technical guidance of producers in tasks such as pruning, irrigation and pest control; 2) to adopt good agricultural practices on the premises, guiding the producer in the implementation of these with the ultimate goal of achieving certification; 3) to improve land management control, through the design and implementation of records of traceability, costs of property, and other activities; 4) to improve familiarity with technology and computing tools, seeking to strengthen good practice through maintaining computer records and tracking time. As part of our 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we have established the overaching target of reducing the water intensity of our product (consumption per bottle) by 10% (compared to 2020); a target that considers the footprint of both own and purchased grape (suppliers). This target guides water efficiency action at then operational level, enabling us to manage our exposure to water stress related risks at sites such as this.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Cachapoal

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our grape suppliers located in Cachapoal are in a water stressed river basin which means that there is already an elevated risk of insufficient availability of water for their operations, and the analysis of the WRI Aqueduct tool indicates that this is expected to increase in the future. In 2024, 35% of grapes processed by Viña Concha y Toro were purchased from suppliers. A decrease in water availability could result in a lesser quality, lower grape yield, additional water supply costs and/or higher prices to buy our grape supplier. These are costs that in turn may have to be passed on to customers. Timeframe

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption to sales

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Decreased in production and sales due to water stressed impacted grape suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

3749165

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

5570188

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Problems in sourcing grapes of sufficient quantity, quality and price could affect our production volume, impacting on our revenues and, potentially, affecting our reputation if it impacts our ability to fulfil commercial expectations. The potential financial impact figure is based on the estimated sales value of product that relies on the purchase of grapes from suppliers in this water basin.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Promotion of best practice and awareness in the value chain

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

19281

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This estimate is based on 2019 expenditure (approx. USD15,000) in advisory services for our providers, supporting them to achieve certification for compliance with the National Sustainability Code for the Chilean wine industry. In addition to expenditure on technical support offered to suppliers on winery management best practice, including water management. Our company covers all associated costs.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Viña Concha y Toro offers its providers technical support in vineyard management best practice, including water management. Additionally, we work with the National Sustainability Code for the Chilean wine industry particularly with long term suppliers. This Code requires suppliers to implement practices including: water management plans, irrigation plans, water quality analysis (biological & chemical), streamflow measurements, and irrigation infrastructure maintenance. During 2016, 28% of suppliers were certified under the National Sustainability Code for the Chilean wine industry. Viña Concha y Toro works alongside INDAP (Institute of Agricultural Development) developing technical proposals for productive partners. These proposals align with the following objectives: 1) to increase productivity of the vineyards, through technical guidance of producers in tasks such as pruning, irrigation and pest control; 2) to adopt good agricultural practices on the premises, guiding the producer in the implementation of these with the ultimate goal of achieving certification; 3) to improve land management control, through the design and implementation of records of traceability, costs of property, and other activities; 4) to improve familiarity with technology and computing tools, seeking to strengthen good practice through maintaining computer records and tracking time. As part of our 2025 Sustainability Strategy, we have established the overaching target of reducing the water intensity of our product (consumption per bottle) by 10% (compared to 2020); a target that considers the footprint of both own and purchased grape (suppliers). This target guides water efficiency action at then operational level, enabling us to manage our exposure to water stress related risks at sites such as this.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

946919077

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

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

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

946919077

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

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

As a winery, almost 100% of our revenues come from wine sales, our core product and activity. A crucial part of our business depends on agricultural production, which is inherently sensitive to changes in the surrounding ecosystem. Climate change can affect grape yields and quality through droughts, heatwaves, frosts, wildfires and storms, while transition factors (e.g., GHG regulation, energy costs, labeling and packaging) can also impact costs and market access. Based on our revenue mix and exposure, we consider ~98% of revenue to be vulnerable. This proportion is calculated as 2024 revenue (USD 966.2m) × 0.98 ≈ USD 946.9m, with the remaining ~2% reflecting ancillary activities that are less exposed. These figures follow CDP/TNFD guidance on vulnerability.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

946919077

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

Select from:
☑ 91-99%

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

946919077

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

Select from:
☑ 91-99%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Our business is water-intensive across the value chain: irrigation and water quality are essential for viticulture, and water is also required for processing and wastewater compliance. Physical water risks (drought, reduced flows/aquifers, competition for the resource, quality) and transition risks (stricter regulation, treatment costs, tariffs) can therefore materially affect production and costs. Consistent with our risk assessment, we consider ~98% of revenue vulnerable to water-related risks. The figure is calculated as 2024 revenue (USD 966.2m) × 0.98 ≈ USD 946.9m, with ~2% corresponding to ancillary activities less exposed to water risks. This approach aligns with CDP/TNFD guidance on vulnerability.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Limari

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

9

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our 7 vineyards and 2 wineries in Limarí are located in a basin with high water-scarcity risk (prolonged drought, lower aquifer recharge, and variable river flows). Any disruption in water availability or quality can reduce grape yield, affect quality, and raise supply/treatment costs, impacting production and revenues. The 11–20% revenue range reflects the materiality of these assets and their exposure to scarcity events, despite mitigation measures (drip irrigation, monitoring, efficiency, and diversified sources).

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :Maipo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

11

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our 8 vineyards, 2 bottling plants, and 1 winery in Maipo lie within a basin with water-scarcity risk. Reduced availability/quality could constrain yields and increase operating costs (abstraction, treatment, compliance), affecting volumes and revenues. The 1–10% range reflects Maipo's commercial relevance but also geographical diversification and resilience measures (irrigation efficiency, soil management, monitoring, contingency plans).

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :Costeras

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

3

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our 3 vineyards in Costeras face water-scarcity risk and local climatic variability. Reductions in water availability/quality may raise costs and reduce yields, with a limited revenue effect given their smaller relative contribution. We report <1% of potentially affected revenue; efficiency and monitoring controls are in place.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Argentina

☑ Rapel

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

21

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 21-30%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our 18 vineyards and 3 wineries in Rapel are located in a basin with significant water stress. Disruptions may lower yields/quality and increase water/treatment costs, impacting production and revenues. Given Rapel's production scale and portfolio weight, we estimate 21–30% of potentially affected revenue, while noting mitigation (technified irrigation, on-site storage, reuse, and monitoring).

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :Mataquito

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

4

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

4 vineyards located in the Mataquito river basin, is exposed to water scarcity risk, which could limit irrigation availability during dry seasons and increase supply costs. A disruption in water availability or quality could reduce grape yields and affect wine production volumes. While the potential impact on our global revenue is less than 1%, the site is considered substantively exposed due to its sensitivity to drought conditions and irrigation constraints in the basin.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :Mendoza

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

17

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our 12 vineyards, 4 wineries, and 1 bottling plant in Mendoza face chronic water stress and variable meltwater/river flows. Water shortfalls or quality issues can limit yields, affect quality, and raise water/compliance costs, impacting revenues. We estimate 11–20% potentially affected revenue, considering resilience measures (efficient irrigation, source management, on-site storage).

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :Maule

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

10

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our 8 vineyards and 2 wineries in Maule are in a basin with scarcity risk. Water disruptions may raise costs and reduce yields, affecting volumes and revenues. Considering Maule’s production share and existing mitigations, we estimate 1–10% of potentially affected revenue.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :Aconcagua

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Our vineyard in Aconcagua is exposed to water scarcity. Shortages or quality declines may raise costs and affect yields. Given its smaller relative weight, <1% of revenue is potentially affected; efficiency, storage, and monitoring controls are in place.
[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ No

(3.3.3) Comment

In the reporting year we had no water-related regulatory violations and received no fines, enforcement orders or other penalties across all operations (Chile, Argentina, USA). Compliance is verified through operating permits for wastewater (RIL/effluent) and abstraction, routine internal monitoring and audits, and third-party assessments (e.g., Chilean Sustainability Code; ISO 14001 at site level where applicable). Results are reported to competent authorities and reviewed by corporate HSE/Compliance teams.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Ability to diversify business activities

(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

☑ Chile

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In Chile, the ability to produce wines beyond the 45th parallel represents an opportunity for Viña Concha y Toro. As more areas become viable for winemaking due to temperature changes, new valleys can provide interesting quality for our product line. This potential scenario is aligned with our long-standing philosophy of researching new productive lands within the national territory to secure quality and diversity. By modelling future climate scenarios at a local level, the company seeks to anticipate organoleptic characteristics by valley and plan future production accordingly. Any change of this nature also enables the development/implementation of adaptive technologies that can be replicated in other markets, helping maintain competitiveness.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Concha y Toro anticipates an increase in revenues due to the expansion of new products in consequences on the prediction of new characteristicas of our production lands due to climate change.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

888203

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

2654550

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Potential financial benefits derived from an effective adaptive strategy are related to increases in sales due to the capacity of developing new products from new vineyards that could meet the agricultural criteria for grape growing. The financial impact is estimated according to the annual production from new vineyards located in new wine-growing areas, considering an increase of 1% -2% in our grape production.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1300000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Within the costs of realizing this opportunities are the needed assessments to anticipate and trace the characteristics of the terrains to iniciate the second stage of development. Becasue these new products will belong to the same family of products Concha y Toro already offers, there are no anticipated costos related to new manufacturing lines needed.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The Company is constantly researching new productive lands within the national territory, looking for quality and diversity of its products, which has been a philosophy of the winery since its origins. Viña Concha y Toro has found potential locations but has not yet started planting the vineyards. The cost of realizing this opportunity is related to the scoping and evaluation of new locations as well as costs associated with purchasing and planting new vineyards. The cost is estimated according to the cost of acquisition and operation of vineyards in new areas. This considers the acquisition of 200ha of vineyards + annual operating costs.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Increased resilience to impacts of climate change

(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

☑ Chile

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Limari

☑ Rapel

☑ Other, please specify :Miapo, Costeras (Casablanca), Mataquito, Maule

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We estimate that 100% of our own vineyards in Chile are in water-stressed basins, in addition to all of the grape producers in our supply chain, who operate in the same river basins. Analysis of climate change scenarios shows that water scarcity is expected to increase in Chile (our main country of production). As such, it is of great strategic importance that Viña Concha y Toro manages this risk in an appropriate way. As all wine producers will face similar physical changes, there is also an opportunity to gain a competitive advantage in the industry through being proactive in tackling this risk and improving the resilience of our operations.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Maintining production capacity in a water scarcity context through resilience practices

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Concha y Toro through its sustasinability strategy and climate change commitments looks to navigate the impacts of climate change maintining or even increasing its production capacity

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

14206042

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

24053953

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Since water is available for free for productive purposes, in Chile the reduction of water consumption alone does not impose substantial financial impact. However, water efficiency is relevant in terms of resilience in the face of growing water scarcity which allows us to maintain productivity levels and avoid the closure of operations. The potential financial impact figure is based on the percentage of our current production which is in highly water stressed areas, considering the sales revenue associated with this activity. This gives an indication of the financial importance of resilience in our production processes.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

52052

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

These costs are related to the % of operational expenses that are destined to water efficiency projects.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

To realize this opportunity, we have made water management an integral part of our Sustainability Strategy: aiming to use the most efficient technologies, apply best practice (in our direct operations and supply chain), and set ambitious efficiency targets. Under an overarching "zero water waste" principle, that we aim to embed throughout our value chain, we have set 2025 targets to reduce the water intensity of our product (consumption per bottle) by 10% (relative to 2020), and to implement additional water efficiency in 50% of our production processes. To deliver these targets and improve our resilience, Viña Concha y Toro is working on

irrigation alternatives that optimize the use of water, carrying out field tests that consider variables such as evapotranspiration and satellite precision agriculture. In addition, through our Center

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Shift in consumer preferences

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

New regulations and initiatives to provide supported environmental information to consumers are expected in some of our main markets. Among consumers with high awareness of climate change, this is an opportunity for Viña Concha y Toro considering that the company has had a quite well known environmental performance. For example, we have been estimating the carbon emissions related to our products since 2010 and also developing Life Cycle Assessments (LCA) for products. The results of these measurements showed that our products have a better environmental performance than our competition. The company has increased its organic production in recent years in response to the increased demand for products with this attribute. Currently, 100% of Fetzer Vineyards production in the US and 32% of Cono Sur production in Chile is organic.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Concha y Toro anticipates an increase in revenues due to the preference of consumers to choose products with lower environmental impacts.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

4431623

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

8859088

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Changes in regulation enforcing carbon labeling can increase demand for our products. The potential financial benefits of this opportunity were estimated considering the increase in sales derived from the increase in demand. An annual increase in demand for our products derived from the supply of products with sustainable attributes of between 0.6% -2.4% is considered. Also, our products are 'low carbon', compared to IWCA data.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

867000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

These cost responds mainly to an average cost on maintainging the standards of our operational practices and manufacturing lines, to continue to ensure our compliance with regulations

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Continuous work to reduce our environmental impact, including the increase in the use of renewable energy and reducing our carbon footprint. Furthermore, the Company provides meaningful and accurate environmental information to consumers about its performance and is continuously working to help consumers better understand the environmental impacts of different products. The associated cost is related to spending on LCA and carbon footprint measurements and investments to increase our organic production area by 10%.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify :Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

(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

☑ Chile

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As more areas become viable for winemaking due to the changes in average precipitations, new winegorwing regions may become viable in addition to new demand for adaptive technologies to respond to changing operating conditions. Changes of this nature in some of our geographies create the opportunity to develop/implement new adaptive technologies that can be replicated to other markets. These technologies or production changes present opportunities by anticipating events and investing in technological innovation to be ready to face climate change and maintain competitiveness. Concha y Toro winery recognizes that physical climate change could produce growing regions with special characteristics, and it sees an opportunity in relation to being able to predict this trend. By modelling future climate scenarios at a local level, Concha y Toro hopes to take advantage of future organoleptic characteristics of each valley and plan future production based on these predicted conditions. Finally, the adaptive strategy of the Winery is aimed at researching new productive land that would meet the agricultural and quality control objectives as climate shifts open new areas for vineyard development.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Concha y Toro anticipates an increase in revenues by expanding the production capacity of grapes in new areas.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

888203

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

2041845

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Potential financial benefits derived from an effective adaptive strategy are related to increasing our production capacity due to the possibility of growing grapes in new locations linked to the implementation of new adaptive technologies. The financial impact is estimated according to the annual production from new vineyards located in new wine-growing areas, considering an increase of 1% -2% in our grape production.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

870000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

These cost responds mainly to an average cost on maintainging and improving the standards of our operational practices and manufacturing lines.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The company is constantly researching new productive lands within the national territory, looking for quality and diversity of its products, which has been a philosophy of the winery since its origins. Concha y Toro has found potential locations but has not yet started planting the vineyards. The cost is related to the scoping and evaluation of new locations as well as costs associated with purchasing and planting new vineyards. The cost of materializing the opportunity was calculated according to the cost of new plantations, considering 200ha of vineyards in new wine-growing areas.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

946442077

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

Select from:
☑ 91-99%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Climate change opportunities are completely related to the possibility of continuing our production and developing products in a world impacted by climate change. As a winery, closer to a 100% of our revenues comes from the sales of wine, wich is our main poroducts and activity.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

946442077

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

Select from:

☑ 91-99%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Our Water opportunity is focused on the possibility of continuing our production and developing products in a context of water scarcity. As a winery, closer to a 100% of our revenues comes from the sales of wine, wich is our main poroducts and activity.
[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:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Corporate Sustainability Policy

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board's Ethics & Sustainability Committee (three Directors, chaired by an independent Director) has formal accountability for climate topics, as set out in the Corporate Sustainability Policy and Strategy and the Committee's charter approved by the Board. Its remit includes knowing, approving and following up on the Corporate Sustainability Strategy; supporting the Board in sustainability policies and principles; and guiding management in the adoption, monitoring and improvement of ESG practices. The Committee's role is supportive and directive (it does not replace management's responsibilities). Permanent invitees are Corporate Sustainability Management and the Compliance Office, with additional areas participating ad hoc. Climate is a scheduled agenda item in some Board meetings. The full Board meets monthly and is briefed on ESG matters during the year; additionally, the Committee reports quarterly to the Board (March, June, September, December). In 2024 the agenda covered: approval/review of the Corporate Sustainability Policy and the 2023 dual-materiality results (scenario analysis; dependencies/impacts/risks); review of progress vs. the Strategy and stakeholder mapping; presentation of the 2023 Impact Report and consolidated environmental metrics; and the 2023 carbon footprint and Climate Change strategy (target-setting and transition planning). Through these processes the Committee oversees and guides scenario analysis; oversees the setting of corporate targets; monitors progress (quarterly dashboards and annual consolidations); and oversees the development and monitors the implementation of the climate transition plan (e.g., review of the GHG inventory and Climate Change strategy), as well as the assessment of climate-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities (dual-materiality and stakeholder mapping). Trade-offs—for example abatement cost versus resilience benefits—are discussed when approving budgets and program roadmaps presented by the Sustainability team. The Board considers both the risks and opportunities to our own operations and the impact of our operations on the environment when exercising this oversight.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Corporate Sustainability Policy

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board's Ethics & Sustainability Committee (three Directors) has formal accountability for water topics under the Corporate Sustainability Policy and Strategy and the Committee's charter approved by the Board. The Committee's mandate includes approving and following up the Strategy, supporting the Board on sustainability policies, and guiding management on ESG practices; Corporate Sustainability Management and the Compliance Office are permanent members, with other areas joining as needed. Water is a scheduled agenda item in some Board meetings. The Board is briefed on ESG during the year and receives quarterly reports from the Committee. In 2024 the Committee reviewed: the Corporate Sustainability Policy; progress vs. the Strategy; stakeholder mapping; the 2023 Impact Report and consolidated environmental metrics; and planning for the 2025 update of the Strategy. These items include governance of the Zero Water Waste Program and the company's position on water stewardship as set out in the Corporate Sustainability Policy. Accordingly, the Committee oversees and guides scenario analysis (e.g., materiality and risk reviews), oversees the setting of water-related targets, and monitors progress (quarterly to the Board and consolidated annually). It reviews dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities (e.g., water-risk and regulatory compliance assessments) and monitors policy/commitment compliance. Implementation is led by Sustainability Management through the Zero Water Waste program and the Executive Sustainability Committee, with progress and trade-offs—such as efficiency investments versus drought resilience and production—brought to the Committee for direction. The Board considers both the risks and opportunities to our own operations and the impact of our operations on the environment when exercising this oversight.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Corporate Sustainability Policy

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board's Ethics & Sustainability Committee (three Directors, chaired by an independent Director) has formal accountability for biodiversity/nature under the Corporate Sustainability Policy and the Nature-Based Solutions pillar of the Corporate Sustainability Strategy. The Committee's remit is to know, approve and follow up on the Strategy; support the Board in sustainability policies and principles; and guide management in the adoption, monitoring and improvement of ESG practices. Its role is supportive and directive (it does not replace management's responsibilities). Permanent invitees are Corporate Sustainability Management and the Compliance Office, with other areas joining ad hoc as required. Biodiversity is a scheduled agenda item in some Board meetings. The full Board is briefed on ESG during the year and the Committee reports quarterly to the Board. In 2024, the agenda covered progress of the Nature-Based Solutions program and the 2025 goal to have 100% of our area under regenerative practices; FSC® stewardship of native forests; biodiversity monitoring and afforestation results; and planning for the 2025 Strategy refresh. Through these processes the Committee oversees and guides scenario analysis and the assessment of dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities; oversees the setting of targets and monitors progress via quarterly dashboards and annual consolidations; monitors compliance with corporate policies and commitments (e.g., No Net Loss/Net Positive Gain, protected areas and threatened species); and oversees the development and implementation of regenerative and conservation roadmaps (e.g., biodiversity inventories, habitat conservation and afforestation). Trade-offs—such as habitat set-asides or afforestation versus short-term yield and cost—are discussed when approving budgets and program plans presented by Sustainability.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Former Corporate Affairs & Investor Relations executive with 10+ years overseeing ESG disclosures and investor engagement; current member of the Board’s Ethics & Sustainability Committee.

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

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Former Corporate Affairs & Investor Relations executive with 10+ years overseeing ESG disclosures and investor engagement; current member of the Board's Ethics & Sustainability Committee.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

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

Engagement
☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

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

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis
☑ Developing a climate transition plan
☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:
☑ Reports to the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

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

Select from:
☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Sustainability Department, led by the CSO, is responsible for developing and implementing the Corporate Sustainability Strategy across business areas; consolidating environmental metrics from subsidiaries; standardizing methodologies; producing internal benchmarks; facilitating the exchange of good practices; and training employees on how their roles affect environmental aspects. The Department also monitors compliance with corporate policies and roadmap indicators and advises subsidiaries on implementation. Reporting cadence: the CSO reports at least quarterly to the Board through the Ethics & Sustainability Committee and provides ad-hoc briefings when material climate matters arise (e.g., scenario analysis results, target progress, regulatory/compliance issues). These updates inform strategic decisions, business plans and budgets. Through this governance, the Board oversees the setting of climate targets and the development and implementation of the transition plan, and monitors progress against quarterly dashboards and the annual consolidation.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Sustainability Department, led by the CSO, is responsible for implementing the Corporate Sustainability Strategy with a specific focus on water stewardship, including the Zero Water Waste program; consolidating water metrics from subsidiaries; standardizing methodologies; generating internal benchmarks; and enabling knowledge-sharing and training on water efficiency and compliance. The Department tracks roadmap indicators and policy adherence and advises subsidiaries on implementation. Reporting cadence: the CSO reports at least quarterly to the Board via the Ethics & Sustainability Committee and delivers ad-hoc briefings on water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities (e.g., water-risk reviews, target progress, regulatory/compliance assessments). These updates feed into strategic decisions, business plans and budgets. This governance allows the Board to oversee the setting of water targets and to monitor progress through quarterly dashboards and the annual consolidation.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Sustainability Department, led by the CSO, is responsible for developing and implementing the Corporate Sustainability Strategy with the departments linked to each of the pillars or action focuses, review of metrics and monitoring indicators for the respective roadmaps, and annual monitoring and follow-up. It monitors and advises the subsidiaries regarding corporate methodologies and their standardization. It consolidates the metrics of subsidiaries, generates internal benchmarks, and favors conditions for the exchange of best practices between the holding's subsidiaries, to advance together in matters related to the Corporate Sustainability Strategy. It trains the company's collaborators to understand the impacts of their work on environmental aspects. It reports to the Sustainability Committee on progress during the year and to the Board of Directors on consolidated progress and future action plans. During the 2023 fiscal year, the Board of Directors met on three occasions with the Sustainability Department to review the progress of the Strategy. The matters discussed at these meetings are included when talking about

and adopting strategic decisions and business and budgetary plans. The Board of Directors and senior management are informed of environmental, social, and governance matters at meetings scheduled in the established bodies.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

4.1

(4.5.3) Please explain

A defined share of the short-term incentive for the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) —and sustainability leadership where applicable— is explicitly tied to delivery of the Corporate Sustainability Strategy, including climate-related KPIs. For FY2024, approximately 4.1% of total C-suite/board-level monetary incentives was linked to the management of climate issues. Typical metrics include: progress on the Climate Change strategy and transition plan; achievement of decarbonization/energy-efficiency milestones; and governance, disclosure and compliance deliverables. KPIs are proposed by the Sustainability Department, reviewed with the Ethics & Sustainability Committee, and included in the annual incentive plan approved by the Board. Performance is tracked quarterly and consolidated at year-end by HR with validation from Sustainability/Internal Audit; payouts follow a threshold/target/stretch logic and may include a corporate performance modifier.

Water

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

4.1

(4.5.3) Please explain

A defined share of the short-term incentive for the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) —and sustainability leadership where applicable— is explicitly tied to delivery of the Corporate Sustainability Strategy, including water-related KPIs. For FY2024, approximately 4.1% of total C-suite/board-level monetary incentives was linked to the management of water issues. Typical metrics include: progress of the Zero Water Waste Program; water-intensity reduction and efficiency projects; and compliance, stewardship and reporting deliverables. KPIs are proposed by the Sustainability Department, reviewed with the Ethics & Sustainability Committee, and included in the annual incentive plan approved by the Board. Performance is tracked quarterly and consolidated at year-end by HR with validation from Sustainability/Internal Audit; payouts follow a threshold/target/stretch logic and may include a corporate performance modifier.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Achievement of climate transition plan

Emission reduction
☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative
☑ Reduction in emissions intensity
☑ Increased share of renewable energy in total energy consumption
☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency
☑ Improvements in emissions data, reporting, and third-party verification
☑ Energy efficiency improvement
☑ Reduction in total energy consumption

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:
☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

A bonus is awarded to the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) under the company's Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plans, contingent on delivery of the Corporate Sustainability Strategy and of climate-related KPIs. Typical KPIs cover progress and achievement of climate targets, implementation of emissions-reduction initiatives, energy efficiency and renewable-energy milestones, improvements in GHG data/assurance, and milestones of the climate transition plan. KPIs are proposed by the Sustainability Department, reviewed with the Ethics & Sustainability Committee, and included in the annual incentive plan approved by the Board. Performance is tracked quarterly and consolidated at year-end by HR with validation from Sustainability/Internal Audit; payouts are proportional to results against threshold/target/stretch.

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

By directly linking the CSO's incentives to climate KPIs, the company aligns leadership accountability with its climate transition plan—prioritizing decarbonization projects, allocating resources, improving data quality/assurance and triggering timely corrective actions. This mechanism accelerates delivery of energy-efficiency and renewable projects, supports achievement of absolute and intensity-based GHG targets, and embeds climate considerations into strategic and budget decisions.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Achievement of climate transition plan

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

☑ Reduction in water consumption volumes – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

A bonus is awarded to the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) under the Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plans, contingent on delivery of the Corporate Sustainability Strategy and water-related KPIs. Typical KPIs include progress and achievement of water-efficiency/consumption-reduction targets in direct operations, milestones of the Zero Water Waste Program, compliance and stewardship deliverables, and data/reporting improvements. KPIs are reviewed with the Ethics & Sustainability Committee and approved by the Board; performance is monitored quarterly and consolidated by HR with Sustainability/Internal Audit validation; payouts reflect performance versus threshold/target/stretch.

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

Tying incentives to water KPIs focuses leadership on delivering water-efficiency projects and reuse/recycling initiatives, ensuring robust governance and early identification of gaps. This supports continuous improvement in water intensity and consumption, advances the Zero Water Waste roadmap, and integrates water stewardship into operational and investment planning.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(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

The Corporate Sustainability Policy applies organization-wide across Viña Concha y Toro and all subsidiaries (e.g., Concha y Toro, Viña Cono Sur, Trivento Bodegas Argentinas, Bonterra) and extends to the value chain (direct operations, upstream suppliers and growers, and downstream partners/customers). It sets mandatory principles and minimum management requirements for climate change, energy, water, waste, and biodiversity, defines governance (Board Ethics & Sustainability Committee oversight and CSO leadership), and establishes time-bound targets and KPIs. For the upstream chain, the policy is implemented through procurement requirements and the supplier code of conduct (compliance, environmental performance, water stewardship, and biodiversity standards). For the downstream chain, it covers product stewardship and responsible communications. Performance is monitored via annual planning and reporting cycles, internal controls/audits, and regular Board/Committee reviews.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to No Net Loss

☑ Commitment to Net Positive Gain

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy
☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas
☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
☑ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species
☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues
☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems
☑ Commitment to engage in integrated, multi-stakeholder landscape (including river basin) initiatives to promote shared sustainability goals

Climate-specific commitments
☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy
☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Water-specific commitments
☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes
☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

Social commitments
☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions
☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement
☑ Description of biodiversity-related performance standards
☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems
☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation
☑ Description of renewable electricity procurement practices
☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets
☑ Description of dependencies on natural resources and ecosystems

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement
☑ Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

politica-sustentabilidad-corporativa-en.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

☑ B Corporation
☑ Pledge to Net Zero
☑ Science-Based Targets for Nature (SBTN)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)
☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
☑ High Conservation Value (HCV) Resource Network [F and B only]
☑ World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

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

Viña Concha y Toro participates in the selected collaborative frameworks as a signatory/participant and active user of their guidance. We disclose annually and align our governance and risk-management practices with TCFD and are progressing the integration of TNFD recommendations into nature-related assessment and reporting. Our decarbonization and resource-efficiency roadmaps follow the methodologies of the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) and we are developing nature-related objectives informed by SBTN. Through WBCSD and sector platforms (e.g., International Wineries for Climate Action, The Porto Protocol, Wine in Moderation), we share good practice, benchmark performance and collaborate on tools and pilots. We are members of the UN Global Compact and report to CDP; for water we apply Water Footprint Network methods. Where applicable (e.g., B Corp certification pathways), we use the standards to strengthen policies, target-setting

and verification. Participation is coordinated by the Sustainability Department and overseen by the Ethics & Sustainability Committee to ensure that requirements from these frameworks are embedded into policies, targets, KPIs and public reporting across our value chain.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Board's Ethics & Sustainability Committee oversees external policy engagement to ensure alignment with our Corporate Sustainability Policy and Strategy (climate, water, biodiversity). The Corporate Sustainability Office (CSO) runs a four-step control process: 1) Pre-engagement screening. Any proposed engagement (direct or via trade associations/intermediaries) is reviewed by the CSO against our Policy, targets and transition plans, the latest science-based goals (Paris Agreement, Kunming–Montreal GBF, SDG 6), and the risks/opportunities identified through our dual-materiality assessment (e.g., drought and water stress, climate adaptation in vineyards, nature impacts in our sourcing regions). 2) Approval & logging. Approved engagements are recorded in a central registry (objective, counterpart, scope, potential policy link). Material items are elevated to the Ethics & Sustainability Committee. 3) Monitoring of intermediaries. We perform annual due

diligence of trade associations we support (e.g., Vinos de Chile A.G., Wine Institute of California, Bodegas de Argentina, Santiago/California Chambers of Commerce). We review their environmental position statements and submissions. Where misalignment is identified, we: (i) request clarification, (ii) advocate for alignment with our Policy and global goals, (iii) publicly clarify our own position if needed, and (iv) escalate to the Committee, which can decide to suspend or withdraw support. 4) Reporting & escalation. The CSO reports quarterly to the Ethics & Sustainability Committee and annually to the Board on engagements, outcomes, and conflicts identified/resolved. Complementary controls include a Corporate Donations Policy (any political contributions would require prior Board approval; as a matter of practice we do not make political donations) and periodic training for relevant executives. This process ensures that our external engagement supports our climate, water and biodiversity strategy (e.g., efficient irrigation and water stewardship, decarbonization and resilience in vineyards, and nature-positive practices) and prevents lobbying that conflicts with global environmental goals.
[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

South America
☑ Other trade association in South America, please specify :Wines of Chile (Vinos de Chile)

(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
☑ Water

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

Wines of Chile is a private, non-profit trade association representing Chilean wine producers whose strategy includes a strong sustainability pillar (e.g., the Sustainability Code and sector R&D). Its policy engagement typically supports climate-smart agriculture, efficient water use and regulatory compliance to enhance drought resilience and environmental performance. Our position is consistent with those aims and we promote them through our participation in sector working groups and by sharing technical inputs on water efficiency, climate risk management and circular practices. Any potential misalignment is reviewed by the CSO and escalated to the Ethics & Sustainability Committee under our governance process.

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

610292

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

Membership/program contributions supporting collective R&D, codes/guidance, and constructive policy engagement on climate adaptation and water stewardship that inform feasible, science-based standards.

(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

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

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 :Wine Institute (California, USA)

(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

☑ Water

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

Wine Institute engages on climate and water topics relevant to wineries (e.g., climate-smart practices, water efficiency, and regulatory alignment). Our position is consistent; we share technical feedback and endorse guidance that improves environmental performance and compliance. Potential divergences are addressed through our internal review and escalation process.

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

106348

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

Membership fees to support programs and dialogue with state agencies on climate- and water-related rules affecting wineries, encouraging feasible, science-based requirements.

(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

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ GRI
☑ IFRS
☑ TCFD
☑ TNFD
☑ Other, please specify :SASB, BCG 461 CMF

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

☑ Water
☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Content of environmental policies
☑ Value chain engagement
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Public policy engagement
☑ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

“I. Scope of the Report”; “II. Independent External Verification”; “3. Sustainability Governance”; “5.6 Our Planet (Zero Water Waste, Climate Action, Nature-Based Solutions)”.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Impacts_2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Corporate sustainability report summarizing governance, strategy, and consolidated environmental metrics; externally verified by Deloitte under ISAE 3000. Scope covers majority-controlled winemaking operations and excludes affiliates and non-wine businesses.

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ IFRS

☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

“Focus and Scope”; “Climate Governance”; “Metrics and Results”.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Carbon_2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Program report consolidating the GHG management approach for winemaking subsidiaries (operational-control scope), governance and policy framework, targets and results; verified/assured information is referenced in the Impact Report.

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ IFRS

☑ TNFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Biodiversity indicators
☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

“01. Governance”; “02. Strategy”; “03. Risk Management”; “04. Metrics and Goals”; “Native Forest Sustainable Forest Management Certification / FSC® Audits”.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Nature_2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Program report for Nature-Based Solutions describing governance, TNFD-aligned risk/impact work, scope across own operations and adjacent watersheds, and FSC-certified native forest management with independent audits (SGS).

Row 4

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI
☑ IFRS

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

“Water Governance — Management Levels and Areas”; “Metrics and Goals”.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Water_2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Program report for Zero Water Waste detailing governance, responsibilities, risk management and annual metrics, with scope applied across the winemaking subsidiaries and implementation led by the Corporate Sustainability team.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

☑ Other local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts driving forces, please specify

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The analysis of the RCP 8.5 scenario (a pessimistic, high emission scenario) finds that the locations where Viña Concha y Toro has its vineyards may see: rainfall variability, decreased rainfall, increased temperatures, heat waves, increase in extreme weather events, natural disasters and a dry climate. These climate stressors may lead to a range of water-related outcomes, including: altering vine growth cycles and timing of the harvest, affecting grape quality (sugar levels), limiting water availability for irrigation, damaging fruits, and causing increase in diseases and pests (due to rainfall). River basins may face water scarcity with temperature and precipitation becoming an increasingly limiting factor for grape production. In the face of these new scenarios, the geographic location of future operations might change, with potential opportunities for the development of new growing regions and products.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Viña Concha y Toro uses climate change scenario analysis as a tool for evaluating its exposure to short-, medium-, and long-term risk factors associated with climate change. Our initial analysis has considered two main scenarios, RCP2.6 and RCP8.5, covering the two most extreme scenarios of the IPCC. These were analysed in detail, in order to assess the effect and implications for VCT in the worst possible situation to anticipate and generate risk mitigation measures (RCP 8.5), and the best possible situation characterised by rapid changes to low emission technologies and global cooperation to reduce them (RCP 2.6). As described, the management of climate-related risks identified by this analysis follows the established, integrated risk management process.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Acute physical

☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology
☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

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

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The analysis of the RCP 8.5 scenario (a pessimistic, high emission scenario) finds that the locations where Viña Concha y Toro has its vineyards may see: rainfall variability, decreased rainfall, increased temperatures, heat waves, increase in extreme weather events, natural disasters and a dry climate. These climate stressors may lead to a range of water-related outcomes, including: altering vine growth cycles and timing of the harvest, affecting grape quality (sugar levels), limiting water availability for irrigation, damaging fruits, and causing increase in diseases and pests (due to rainfall). River basins may face water scarcity with temperature and precipitation becoming an increasingly limiting factor for grape production. In the face of these new scenarios, the geographic location of future operations might change, with potential opportunities for the development of new growing regions and products.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Viña Concha y Toro uses climate change scenario analysis as a tool for evaluating its exposure to short-, medium-, and long-term risk factors associated with climate change. Our initial analysis has considered two main scenarios, RCP2.6 and RCP8.5, covering the two most extreme scenarios of the IPCC. These were analysed in detail, in order to assess the effect and implications for VCT in the worst possible situation to anticipate and generate risk mitigation measures (RCP 8.5), and the best possible situation characterised by rapid changes to low emission technologies and global cooperation to reduce them (RCP 2.6). As described, the management of climate-related risks identified by this analysis follows the established, integrated risk management process.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ 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

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IPCC RCP 2.6 emissions scenario represents the "best case" approach for carbon emissions, limiting the temperature increase to 2ºC. It was selected for the evaluation of the implications for Concha y Toro of a future characterised by global cooperation to reduce emissions leading to a rapid transition to low emission technologies. Key features of this scenario include: a rapid reduction in net emissions with a peak around 2020; Peaks of atmospheric concentration of CO2 of 430 480 ppm for 2050; A 70% cumulative reduction from 2010 to 2100 with significant changes in the energy matrix and land use; Global carbon price agreements and global cooperation; CO2 emissions reduced by a combination of energy efficiency, increased use of renewables and nuclear, use of carbon capture and storage, increased use of bioenergy. A crucial element in the different scenarios, and which also influences a company like VCT, is land use. Land use influences climate in several ways, including direct emissions from land use change, biogeophysical impacts (such as changes in albedo and porosity of surfaces), and the size of the remaining stock of vegetation. which influences the capture of CO2 from the atmosphere. For the RCP 2.6 scenario, an increase in cultivated area is expected, since part of it would be used for bioenergy, in line with what was mentioned above. There would also be an increase in the total area used, due to reforestation activities that help increase carbon sequestration. Prairie cultivation would remain stable, since the increase in animal production would occur by changing from an extensive production system to an intensive one.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Viña Concha y Toro uses climate change scenario analysis as a tool for evaluating its exposure to short-, medium-, and long-term risk factors associated with climate change. Our initial analysis has considered two main scenarios, RCP2.6 and RCP8.5, covering the two most extreme scenarios of the IPCC. These were analysed in detail, in order to assess the effect and implications for VCT in the worst possible situation to anticipate and generate risk mitigation measures (RCP 8.5), and the best possible situation characterised by rapid changes to low emission technologies and global cooperation to reduce them (RCP 2.6). As described, the management of climate-related risks identified by this analysis follows the established, integrated risk management process.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ 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

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The IPCC RCP 2.6 emissions scenario represents the "best case" approach for carbon emissions, limiting the temperature increase to 2ºC. It was selected for the evaluation of the implications for Concha y Toro of a future characterised by global cooperation to reduce emissions leading to a rapid transition to low emission technologies. Key features of this scenario include: a rapid reduction in net emissions with a peak around 2020; Peaks of atmospheric concentration of CO2 of 430 480 ppm for 2050; A 70% cumulative reduction from 2010 to 2100 with significant changes in the energy matrix and land use; Global carbon price agreements and

global cooperation; CO2 emissions reduced by a combination of energy efficiency, increased use of renewables and nuclear, use of carbon capture and storage, increased use of bioenergy. A crucial element in the different scenarios, and which also influences a company like VCT, is land use. Land use influences climate in several ways, including direct emissions from land use change, biogeophysical impacts (such as changes in albedo and porosity of surfaces), and the size of the remaining stock of vegetation. which influences the capture of CO2 from the atmosphere. For the RCP 2.6 scenario, an increase in cultivated area is expected, since part of it would be used for bioenergy, in line with what was mentioned above. There would also be an increase in the total area used, due to reforestation activities that help increase carbon sequestration. Prairie cultivation would remain stable, since the increase in animal production would occur by changing from an extensive production system to an intensive one.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Viña Concha y Toro uses climate change scenario analysis as a tool for evaluating its exposure to short-, medium-, and long-term risk factors associated with climate change. Our initial analysis has considered two main scenarios, RCP2.6 and RCP8.5, covering the two most extreme scenarios of the IPCC. These were analysed in detail, in order to assess the effect and implications for VCT in the worst possible situation to anticipate and generate risk mitigation measures (RCP 8.5), and the best possible situation characterised by rapid changes to low emission technologies and global cooperation to reduce them (RCP 2.6). As described, the management of climate-related risks identified by this analysis follows the established, integrated risk management process.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas platform, developed by the World Resources Institute (WRI), is a valuable tool for assessing and mapping water risks globally. Its main objective is to facilitate strategic decision-making regarding project location, supply chain management and water use planning by providing detailed information on scarcity, quality, flooding and community vulnerability. In addition, it promotes transparency and collaboration among different stakeholders to effectively address water-related challenges.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Viña Concha y Toro uses this tool to evaluate future water scenarios and address water stress. An area is under water stress when the demand for water exceeds the availability of resources in that region. In other words, the demand for water in the area exceeds the amount of water sustainably available.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Net-zero by 2050 with rising carbon prices and fast power decarbonization/electrification; uncertainties: policy speed, tech costs, supplier readiness.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Used to test transition risks/opportunities and target feasibility consistent with our SBTi 1.5°C pathway; informs capex timing, energy sourcing and abatement costs. [Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Business division

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

The findings of this scenario analysis are taken into account in the company's risk and opportunity analysis and management processes, with insights used by various departments to inform strategic actions, such as land acquisition and supply chain management. As part of our Sustainability Strategy, we have established both short, medium and long-term targets associated with our climate change impact. In 2023, we renewed our commitment to the Science Based Target initiative, to reduce our scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions by 42% by 2030, a target that has been validated by the SBTi, and to achieve zero net emissions by 2040. In response to the focal questions, we have found that: 1. The effect of climate change on temperature could create physical risks and opportunities for VCT, such as: • Changes in temperatures will alter the growth cycles of the vines. • Higher temperatures can affect blood sugar levels. • Heat waves cause damage to plants and fruit, although the level depends on the phenological stage of the wine grapes; • An increase in the risk of smoke affecting the quality of the grapes (color, ashes, etc.). The change in temperatures could also create a risk of pests and diseases. 2. The transitional risks for VCT are mainly associated with the use of energy for irrigation, field machinery, production and logistics. There could be an increase in costs because the price of carbon could increase. 3. In terms of opportunities these may include: • Increased efficiency – for example, by developing drought-resistant hybrids. • Development of new products and services low in emissions and use of water- packaging, logistics, renewable energy, etc.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

(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

The findings of this scenario analysis are taken into account in the company's risk and opportunity analysis and management processes, with insights used by various departments to inform strategic actions, such as land acquisition and supply chain management. As part of our Sustainability Strategy, we have established both short, medium and long-term targets associated with our climate change impact. In 2023, we renewed our commitment to the Science Based Target initiative, to reduce our scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions by 42% by 2030, a target that has been validated by the SBTi, and to achieve zero net emissions by 2040. In response to the focal questions, we have found that: 1. The effect of climate change on temperature could create physical risks and opportunities for VCT, such as: • Harvests may start early. In terms of rainfall, the reduction of these will affect the availability of water for irrigation, affecting the quality and reliability of the wines. •An increase in the risk of fire due to drier weather conditions is also forecast. 2. There could also be regulatory risks associated with water rights and the restriction of these to avoid overexploitation of the resource. 3. In terms of opportunities these may include: • Increased efficiency – for example, by developing drought-resistant hybrids. • Water withdrawal reduction and water waste generation.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

The commitment covers both spending and revenue. We will not fund or generate revenue from activities that contribute to fossil-fuel expansion (e.g., exploration/extraction, new fossil power assets or infrastructure, ICE fleet expansion, or petrochemical production). Our core business has none of these activities. Implementation relies on investment screening, procurement standards, supplier code requirements, and an electrification/renewables roadmap. Oversight: Ethics & Sustainability Committee. Monitoring through annual reviews and disclosures in our Impact/Sustainability Report.

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

Select from:

☑ Our climate transition plan is voted on at Annual General Meetings (AGMs)

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

Assumptions: availability of renewable electricity; declining abatement technology costs; rising carbon prices; efficiency and electrification potential in operations and logistics; supplier engagement capacity for Scope 3. Dependencies: grid decarbonization and permitting timelines in core geographies; stable access to capex; data coverage/quality across the value chain. Resourcing: funded through prioritized capex/opex for efficiency, electrification, renewable sourcing and logistics optimization; procurement levers embedded in category strategies. KPIs are aligned with our SBTi-validated targets and tracked quarterly.

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

We renewed our near-term SBTi targets with a 2022 base year and brought net-zero forward to 2040. Progress is tracked via quarterly dashboards and annual consolidations. Delivery actions include energy and process efficiency, electrification and renewable sourcing, logistics optimization, data and verification improvements, and supplier engagement for key Scope 3 categories. Governance and disclosures are integrated into our Corporate Sustainability Strategy and reviewed by the Ethics & Sustainability Committee.

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

Carbon_2024.pdf,Carbon_2024.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

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

In addition to FLAG and no-deforestation, water stewardship (Zero Water Waste) is embedded through efficiency, reuse/storage and basin-level risk management. KPIs track withdrawals/consumption intensity and effluent compliance alongside biodiversity safeguards.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply
☑ Products and services
☑ Upstream/downstream value chain
☑ Investment in R&D
☑ Operations
[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

The main impact of climate change on our products strategy relates to potential opportunities. Viña Concha y Toro undertakes market and brand research around its products and these studies indicate that there is shifting consumer demand towards brands that can demonstrate positive and sustainable environmental and social performance. This presents a potential opportunity for the Company, since through the integration of our Sustainability Strategy into our commercial strategy we have established leading environmental commitments and practices. For example, we were the first Latin American company to have an SBTi verified Science Based Target for emissions reduction. The Company is currently in the process of reviewing its products and the available environmental attributes in order to define the brands that will work on these aspects in the coming years. The objective is to expand the offer of products with environmental attributes of the company (low in carbon, made with renewable energy, etc.) to offer consumers alternatives with low environmental impact. Since 2018, we have promoted BIB (Bag in Box) products and the packaging of products at their final destination (mainly UK and Germany), initiatives that allow us to reduce the life cycle carbon footprint of our product.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

The company has had a carbon footprint program with packaging suppliers since 2011. We request that our main packaging suppliers measure and externally verify the carbon footprint of their products annually. Viña Concha y Toro uses the information reported by suppliers to enhance sustainability practices in our supply chain, and evaluate critical environmental and social risks associated with the management of our suppliers. The emissions from our value chain are part of our supply chain is included in the scope of our 2030 Science Based Target (for a reduction of 42% by 2023 Scope 1,2&3). For the period 2021-2025, the program advances towards the commitment to reduce emissions based on science using the Science Based Targets initiative methodology. - Grape purchase: The incidence of the purchase of grapes is extrapolated from own emission factors. This is feasible given that the management of the vineyards of producers follows the same practices of the own

vineyards. - Packaging supplies: Considering that glass bottles are one of our main inputs, we have been working since 2010 to reduce the weight of our containers. This, added to the work of our glass suppliers to reduce their emission factor, has allowed us to reduce our carbon footprint by 40% since 2017, associated only with this concept. - In turn, Viña Concha y Toro has worked with its carriers to improve efficiency in transportation issues through the GiroLimpio initiative, with which we hope to reduce our carbon footprint associated with transportation more significantly in the coming years. Our 2025 strategy also considers goals fow our Water performance including: - Implementation of reduction projects in vineyards, improvement of humidity measurement systems. Implementation of a multidisciplinary Water Leader Group between operational areas. Awareness campaign "Zero Water Waste" in holding-level facilities. - Measurement of water footprint, measurement and consolidation of consumption for the holding. Survey of projects and actions to be implemented in vineyards, wineries and plants. Implementation of Barrier Ball in irrigation ponds.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

The company has started R&D projects related to climate change through its Research and Innovation Center, and this theme has influenced our strategy in terms of investment in R&D. The Innovation Research Center (CII) was born in 2014 as a response to the changes and new challenges that the industry continually faces, showing Viña Concha y Toro's commitment to the development of national viticulture and focusing its efforts on applied research that responds to the real industry needs. One of the six programs of the Center in its 2016-2020 Strategic Plan has been Water Resources and Climate Change, which sits alongside other potentially relevant research areas that include product design and circular winemaking practices. Since 2018 we are working on the "Strengthening of the plant material" of the vineyards and on "Adaptation to Water Stress". These lines of research are part of the IIC's strategic programs for the 2018-2022 period. During 2021, we completed the project "Strengthening of the nursery's plant material", which has been carried out with the Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG) of Chile and with leading national and international actors in the field of plant material reinforcement.. The result of this program was the creation of "Plants 2.0": fortified plants that allow Concha y Toro's plant nursery to deliver clean and strengthened plants to the agricultural operations unit. The project has produced plants that are more resistant to viruses and wood fungi, and has a second objective to transfer this knowledge to SAG as to develop certifications on fortified plants for the entire Chilean agricultural ecosystem. Also during the year 2021, within the framework of the Climate Change and Wine Quality strategic program, the AquaControl platform was launched, which is aimed at making the use of water resources more efficient, optimizing irrigation in Concha y Toro's vineyards. This platform has been developed with

external business partners, and is powered by artificial intelligence, agro-climatic data and the use of site-specific micrometeorological technologies. The platform provides our winegrowers with a recommendation for irrigation at vineyard level, in terms of frequency and amount of irrigation to be applied.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

As an agricultural company that sells its products globally, climate change has a major influence on Viña Concha y Toro's operational strategy - both in terms of adaptation and mitigation. For example, we apply a range of analytical tools to analyze exposure to potential water-related risks, including climate scenario analysis, water scarcity mapping, and water footprinting. These risks have a strong influence on the Company's water management strategy at an operational level, including the practices and technologies that we implement. The company has drip irrigation in 100% of its vineyards since 2014, but the increase in water stress conditions in recent years has made the company advance its investments in automatic irrigation control technologies, acquisition of new wells for water extraction and stations for measuring weather conditions to more accurately estimate the amount of irrigation. As indicated in 2.3a, we anticipate that water scarcity risks may increase in impact in the short-term. In terms of mitigation, we have established a 2030 Science Based Target, which will be supported by short-term targets set in our Sustainability Strategy that is currently in development following the completion of the 2021-2025 Plan.
[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

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

The consideration of financial risks and opportunities related to climate change, such as water availability and quality and renewable energy consumption, is crucial to our financial success due to the vital importance of water and energy as a production input. In the event of water scarcity, loss of production due to decreased yields or additional costs for providing water, would have substantial financial impacts. Water issues are integrated into our financial planning and investment decisions in several areas. For example, by improving our understanding of water treatment systems, the wastewater area has identified process improvement opportunities for incorporation into the investment plans of vineyards. Viña Concha y Toro is the first vineyard in Chile - and one of the few in the wider industry - to incorporate MBR (membrane bioreactors) technology into its wastewater treatment process. This is expected to influence our financial planning throughout 11-15 years. Similarly, our corporate strategy to reduce CO2 emissions, which includes addressing the reputational and transitional risks of climate change, has allowed us to reduce our costs associated with energy. Energy savings and the direct purchase of renewable energy through supply contracts (PPA) allow savings of approximately USD 1.5 million annually.

[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)

32.9

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

10

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

19.5

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

10

(5.9.5) Please explain

Figures are estimates. The YoY CAPEX increase reflects the continuation of multi-year projects under our Zero Water Waste program: recovery/reuse and storage, irrigation efficiency (scheduling, sensors, metering), and upgrades to wastewater treatment plants. The YoY OPEX increase relates mainly to higher wastewater

disposal/treatment tariffs, energy and chemical reagents, plus maintenance of upgraded systems. The forward +10% (CAPEX and OPEX) reflects carry-over of approved projects and expected cost pressures and compliance improvements.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Internal fee

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply
☑ Navigate regulations
☑ Drive energy efficiency
☑ Drive low-carbon investment
☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
☑ Other, please specify **:Change th company´s mindset regarding climate change**

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Benchmarking against peers

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

The Carbon price used by Concha y Toro was determined by making a comparison with the prices used by similar peer companies. This price has remained the same since it was set, in consequence, there are no other factors or assumptions that could affect the price

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3, other (upstream)

☑ Scope 3, other (downstream)

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Static

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

1

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

1

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

Select all that apply

☑ Operations

☑ Procurement

☑ Product and R&D

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, for all decision-making processes

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

100

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

The internal carbon price is applied by all business units as part of awareness-raising and to incentivize innovation around emissions reductions across the business. For every ton that each business unit emits during the reporting year, that area has to pay the corresponding cost into a central fund. Each business is responsible to follow up on their emissions and comparing what they have achieved to our company commitment in the short and long term.
[Add row]

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

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

[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

☑ Other, please specify :Compliance to current related laws and regulations and Procurement Spent

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

The company has policies in place to evaluate suppliers. Their purpose is to establish and measure sustainability aspects and their practices in key areas. The topics addressed include regulatory compliance, labor conditions, business ethics, and issues related to the company's Human Rights Principles. Environmental aspects that are important to business are also considered. The company also has a program that is directly related to packaging and wrapping material suppliers.

(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

333

Water

(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

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Other, please specify :Compliance to current water-related laws and regulations and Procurement Spent

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

The company has policies in place to evaluate suppliers. Their purpose is to establish and measure sustainability aspects and their practices in key areas. The topics addressed include regulatory compliance, labor conditions, business ethics, and issues related to the company's Human Rights Principles. Environmental aspects that are important to the business are also considered.

(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

333
[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

The main priorities for supply chain management (SCM) are price, quality, service, and sustainability. The 2025 corporate sustainability strategy, highlights the need to strengthen and create value in all relationships with our strategic partners, supported by the integration of ESG factors into the overall SCM strategy.

Water

(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 water

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Concha y Toro, at the moment of prioritizing its engagement with suppliers, considers different elements like basin status, supplier dependence on water, procurement spending and compliance with current water-related laws and regulations.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

For each type of supplier, Concha y Toro establishes different objectives that must be met to ensure the continuity of the work between the company and the supplier: 1. All suppliers must adhere to and comply with Viña Concha y Toro's Code of Ethics and Conduct, as well as the corporate ethical standard. 2. Bottling suppliers must comply with the ethical and environmental standards, which will be replaced by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. 3. Grape suppliers must comply with BSCI and the wine sustainability code, which will be complemented by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. 4. External wineries must comply with environmental sustainability requirements, which will be complemented by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. External service providers (contractors) will continue to be evaluated against the corporate ethical standard.

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

For each type of supplier, Concha y Toro establishes different objectives that must be met to ensure the continuity of the work between the company and the supplier: 1. All suppliers must adhere to and comply with Viña Concha y Toro's Code of Ethics and Conduct, as well as the corporate ethical standard. 2. Bottling suppliers must comply with the ethical and environmental standards, which will be replaced by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. 3. Grape suppliers must comply with BSCI and the wine sustainability code, which will be complemented by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. 4. External wineries must comply with environmental sustainability requirements, which will be complemented by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. External service providers (contractors) will continue to be evaluated against the corporate ethical standard
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline
☑ Off-site third-party audit
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating
☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro actively works with suppliers to help them measure and reduce their emissions, promoting commitment to science-based reduction targets. During 2021, the SBT 2025 Suppliers Program began, made up of 30 of the main packaging suppliers, with whom it is expected to work together to reduce 12 thousand tons of CO2e by 2025. These 30 packaging suppliers are required to work annually on the measurement of their corporate carbon footprint or, failing that, of its subsidiary in Chile. The measurement must consider scopes 1, 2 and 3, and must be verified by an external verifier, and shared with Viña Concha y Toro S.A. no later than the last business day of the month of February considering the measurement of the previous year. In addition, the supplier, like the Winery, must adhere its greenhouse gas emission reduction route to the SBTi (Science Based Targets Initiative).

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Comply with applicable environmental Regulation

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

The main priorities for supply chain management (SCM) are: price, quality, service and sustainability. The 2022 corporate strategic vision highlights the need to strengthen and create value in all relationships with our strategic partners, supported through the integration of ESG factors into the overall SCM strategy. For each type of supplier, different objectives are established: 1. All suppliers must adhere to and comply with Viña Concha y Toro's Code of Ethics and Conduct, as well as the corporate ethical standard. 2. Bottling suppliers must comply with the ethical and environmental standards, which will be replaced by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. 3. Grape suppliers must comply with BSCI and the wine sustainability code, which will be complemented by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. 4. External wineries must comply with environmental sustainability requirements, which will be complemented by the corporate ethical standard in the short term. External service providers (contractors) will continue to be evaluated against the corporate ethical standard.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data 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:

☑ 1-25%

(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

Scope 3 emissions represented 83% of our total carbon footprint in 2022, with 61% associated with suppliers, and the main source of Scope 3 relating specifically to packaging materials (37% of the Company’s total CO2 emissions, and 45% of total Scope 3 emissions in 2022). Within Concha y Toro’s supply chain, packaging suppliers are highly relevant in terms of expenditure and their impact on our carbon footprint. For this reason, they are a key group of suppliers with whom we

undertake climate-related engagement activities. As part of our 1.5C aligned SBTi validated science-based emissions reduction target, the Company has a target to reduce GHG emissions associated with our packaging supplies by 35% by 2025 compared to 2017. Suppliers of packaging material include those who supply bottles, labels, cases, caps and corps, plastics, and other service providers. In order for us to be able to monitor and deliver this target, it is essential that we have robust supplier data and initiatives that address emissions associated with this part of our value chain.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Align to the commitments of Concha y Toro

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

Select from:

☑ No

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Viña Concha y Toro has a specialist department that provides technical advice to external grape producers, including information on water use best practices. The water footprint associated with grape suppliers is over 90% of the water footprint of our supply chain, making this a key group of suppliers to engage within the context of our commitment to reduce our product water footprint by 10% by 2025 (compared to 2020). Since 2010, our main country of operation, Chile, has found itself exposed to high levels of water stress, a trend that we expect to continue in the future on the basis of climate change projections, making this a key supplier group to engage with. The coverage of the engagement focuses on key, long-term suppliers since these are grape producers with whom we have an established relationship and can influence relevant changes.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Align to the commitments of Concha y Toro

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

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(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

We engage with our main customers on GHG and climate change strategies through meetings, consultations and providing information about our sustainability practices including climate change. As requested, we also engage with key customers, such as Tesco, through the CDP supplier platform where we provide detailed information on the GHG emissions of our products and proposed collective areas of opportunities for the reduction of GHG emissions. As part of Corporate Sustainability Strategy 2025, the Company is working with 30 of its core retail customers to align the company's reduction targets with the climate science-based reduction targets of our SBT-enabled customers. This includes major clients such as Tesco, Walmart, Aldi, Sainbury's and other big retailers. In order to maximize our impact and seek collaboration opportunities, we prioritize customer engagement towards our key markets and in those in which we have identified that final consumers have a higher level of awareness and sensitivity to climate change issues. In terms of coverage, the scope of our engagement is calculated according to the number of customers, considering customers with more than 5,000 9L boxes purchased per year (30% of all customers).

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Through engagement with clients we have been able to better communicate our environmental sustainability practices to our customers and work together to improve the environmental performance of our products. We measure the success of these engagement activities in different ways depending on the initiative. For example,

we have changed the bottling / distribution processes for some products to European markets shipping bulk wine and bottling in destination, reducing the carbon footprint in line with our SBTi validated science-based target near term 2023 and long term 2040

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :wine industry stakeholders, including producers, suppliers, universities and neighbouring communities

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

A key part of our engagement strategy is the Center of Research and Innovation (CRI), which aims to improve the competitiveness of the wine industry through technological development, applied research and knowledge transfer. The CRI transfers research results and good practices identified to other wine industry stakeholders, including producers, suppliers, universities and neighbouring communities. We work with our suppliers in the sharing of good management practices for natural resources, including water. The CRI has a building open to the community, serving as a space for conferences, workshops and training experts, as well as a lab available to our supply partners. Communication of sustainability attributes is also a fundamental pillar of the Sustainability Strategy of Viña Concha y Toro. Our goal is to work continuously to inform consumers about the environmental footprint of our products so they can make purchasing decisions in an informed manner. During 2023, we continued communicating with customers about the impacts that our production has on water resources, through our website, integrated report, and water footprint report.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

A way in which success is measured is through our strategic targets and KPIs. We have started the implementation of supplier evaluations through the Sedex platform, with a target of having 200 suppliers on the platform by 2025

[Add row]

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:
☑ Walmart, Inc.

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations
☑ Other change to supplier operations, please specify :Reduce Carbon Footprint

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

Participate as supplier in Walmart's Project Gigaton™ to align targets with a 1.5°C pathway, disclose through CDP Supply Chain, measure product-level carbon footprints (PCF) for Walmart SKUs, reduce emissions via: (i) lightweighting and recycled content in packaging, (ii) modal shift/route optimization for exports to Walmart DCs, (iii) RE procurement for wineries and contract bottlers serving Walmart volumes. Walmart's program aims to reduce/avoid 1 Gt CO_2e by 2030 and already reports >574 Mt engaged reductions globally; leveraging the CDP-linked finance channel is also possible.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply
☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

☑ Increased transparency of upstream/downstream value chain
☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:
☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:
☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

CO_2e: (i) Packaging: Δg/bottle × EF material × bottles sold to Walmart over [lifetime years]; (ii) Logistics: km avoided or mode shift × EF freight × annual Walmart shipments; (iii) Electricity: MWh RE matched to Walmart volumes × grid EF. Water: product water-intensity reduction (L/bottle) × Walmart bottle volumes; intensity baseline aligns with corporate KPI (132.1 L/bottle). Allocation to Walmart based on sales share/sku-specific volumes. Evidence of relationship: public recognition from Walmart Chile (Regeneration Award).
[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(5.13.1) Specify the CDP Supply Chain members that have prompted your implementation of mutually beneficial environmental initiatives and provide information on the initiatives.

Row 1

(5.13.1.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Walmart, Inc.

(5.13.1.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.13.1.4) Initiative ID

Select from:

☑ Ini1

(5.13.1.5) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Other change to supplier operations, please specify :Implementation of emissions reduction initiatives

(5.13.1.6) Details of initiative

Participation in Walmart Project Gigaton to align targets and deliver Scope 1–3 emissions reductions linked to Walmart volumes. Actions include: energy-efficiency upgrades at wineries/warehouses, increased use of renewable electricity, logistics optimization (routing/load factors), and packaging improvements (light-weighting/material efficiency). Managed by the Sustainability Department with Operations, Procurement and Logistics; applicable to sites supplying Walmart.

(5.13.1.7) Benefits achieved

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

(5.13.1.8) Are you able to provide figures for emissions savings or water savings in the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

(5.13.1.11) Please explain how success for this initiative is measured

Annual tracking of tCO_2e avoided attributed to Walmart volumes using GHG Protocol methods; KPI dashboards on energy intensity, renewable electricity share, transport intensity, and packaging intensity; consistency checks against our SBTi-aligned targets (42% by 2030; Net Zero 2040) and reporting via Project Gigaton/CDP.

(5.13.1.12) Would you be happy for CDP Supply Chain members to highlight this work in their external communication?

Select from:

☑ No

[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

We apply the operational control approach, in line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. We consolidate 100% of Scope 1 and 2 emissions from all operated sites and activities over which we set operating policies, regardless of equity share, across our main subsidiaries (Viña Concha y Toro, Viña Cono Sur, Trivento Bodegas Argentinas and Bonterra). Non-operated JVs are excluded from Scopes 1–2 and covered, where relevant, in Scope 3. Leased assets are included when we have operational control. Using one consistent boundary across the group ensures comparability year-to-year and alignment with our third-party assurance (see section 13).

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

We use operational control for all water accounting (withdrawals, discharges and consumption) across operated vineyards, wineries, bottling plants and support sites of Viña Concha y Toro, Viña Cono Sur, Trivento Bodegas Argentinas and Bonterra. This means we report 100% of volumes from sites we operate, independent of equity share, while non-operated locations are excluded and addressed through supplier/Scope 3 engagement. A single boundary across the group improves consistency with climate and biodiversity modules and with our verified indicators.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

We manage waste (including plastics) under the operational control boundary described above. However, following our materiality assessment for this cycle, plastics account for ~0.3% of total waste and the Plastics module is not applicable to our sectoral materiality and current data users; therefore we are not disclosing plastics KPIs in CDP this year. We will reassess materiality annually and disclose if significance increases.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

We apply operational control to define the organizational boundary for biodiversity-related indicators and management (e.g., native forest management on owned/operated land) across Viña Concha y Toro, Viña Cono Sur, Trivento Bodegas Argentinas and Bonterra. Using the same boundary as climate and water ensures internal consistency and transparent tracking of actions and outcomes.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a change in methodology
☑ Yes, a change in boundary

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

During the reporting year, both the methodology and the organizational boundary of the greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory underwent significant changes, improving accuracy, completeness, and consistency of reporting. Methodological changes: A revision and update of emission factors was carried out, prioritizing official and up-to-date sources such as IPCC, DEFRA, EPA, and local factors when available. The data collection system was strengthened, improving traceability of outsourced and third-party activities. For the first time, process emissions under Scope 1 were incorporated, allowing a more complete representation of operational impacts. Methodological consistency was reinforced by applying uniform approaches across all subsidiaries of the holding — Viña Concha y Toro (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), Cono Sur (Chile), and Bonterra (United States) — which previously differed in their level of reporting. In addition, the FLAG (Forest, Land and Agriculture) framework was implemented for the first time, providing a differentiated treatment of emissions and removals associated with agricultural and land use activities. This aligned the inventory with the latest guidance of the GHG Protocol and the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), increasing comparability and transparency. Boundary changes: At the organizational boundary level, a centralized calculation system at the holding level was introduced, ensuring harmonization across all subsidiaries. This eliminated discrepancies between business units and allowed consolidation under a single methodological framework. Nine of the fifteen Scope 3 categories were considered transversally across all subsidiaries, whereas previously not all reported the same categories. The scope of Category 4 (upstream transportation and distribution) was expanded to include the transportation of glass, and the scope of Category 9 (downstream transportation and distribution) was broadened to estimate last-mile emissions up to the final point of sale. This year marked the first time such a comprehensive and centralized estimation was performed, covering all geographies and subsidiaries consistently under the same methodological and boundary framework.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2, location-based
☑ Scope 2, market-based
☑ Scope 3

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

Our organization recalculated its base year and past years' emissions to ensure consistency and comparability following the methodological and boundary changes introduced in 2024. For the first time, the carbon footprint of all winemaking subsidiaries was reported in an integrated and harmonized manner: Concha y Toro (Chile), Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States). Within this group, Concha y Toro alone accounts for nearly 70% of total emissions and is the only subsidiary formally committed to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), with a net zero target by 2040 and a base year of 2022 covering Scopes 1, 2, and 3. To align methodologies, all subsidiaries in 2024 adopted the same measurement scope as Concha y Toro: Scope 1 (Stationary Combustion, Mobile Combustion, Process Emissions, Soil Emissions, Fugitive Emissions, and Fertilizers), Scope 2 (location- and market-based), and nine Scope 3 categories (Purchased Goods and Services, Capital Goods, Fuel- and Energy-related Activities, Upstream Transportation and Distribution, Waste from Operations, Business Travel, Employee Commuting, Downstream Transportation and Distribution, and End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products). This alignment expanded reportability and eliminated inconsistencies across the group. Given Concha y Toro's methodological robustness and consistency between 2022 and 2024, its inventory was used as the anchor dataset for recalculations. An extrapolation method was applied: historical emission factors and year-specific activity data (2022 and 2023) were combined with Concha y Toro's emission profile to derive equivalent estimates for the other subsidiaries. This ensures that recalculated inventories are based on verifiable data from the most representative subsidiary, while reflecting annual variations. This recalculation was essential to maintain comparability and transparency. By harmonizing scopes, categories, and boundaries retroactively, the holding created a consistent time series aligned with best practice, providing a reliable baseline for monitoring progress toward decarbonization 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.

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

Our organization reports Scope 2 emissions using both the location-based and market-based methods, in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. This ensures transparency and comparability, showing both the grid-average intensity of the countries where we operate and the contractual instruments that support our renewable electricity strategy. The Scope 2 inventory covers the entire electricity consumption of all wineries and subsidiaries of Viña Concha y Toro Holding, applying a standardized methodology across geographies. For the location-based approach, emissions are calculated using country-specific grid factors. For the market-based approach, the company accounts for renewable Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), onsite photovoltaic generation, and internationally recognized energy attribute certificates. Our market-based reporting demonstrates that 100% of the electricity consumed by the holding is sourced from renewable energy. Renewable PPAs secure long-term traceability and stability of supply. In addition, the company operates its own photovoltaic plants, which directly provide renewable electricity and consolidate the role of onsite infrastructure in the transition to clean energy. To cover the remaining share of demand, the holding systematically purchases International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs). These certificates ensure that all residual grid consumption is matched with renewable generation, complying with market boundary criteria and guaranteeing credibility. Since 2022, I-RECs have been adopted at the holding level, creating a unified system of corporate energy traceability across all subsidiaries. This practice allows every winery to align under the same renewable sourcing framework, strengthening the transparency of climate commitments and ensuring consistency of Scope 2 reporting globally. In 2024, I-REC procurement was expanded through a wind park in Chile, including a security margin to guarantee full coverage of non-renewable electricity. Through the combined use of PPAs, onsite generation, and I-RECs, the holding ensures that all electricity consumption is 100% renewable. This integrated approach enhances resilience, secures full traceability of renewable attributes, and reflects a robust and credible pathway toward decarbonization across all operations.
[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

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50935.7

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 includes stationary combustion (boilers, generators, frost towers), mobile combustion (tractors, forklifts, trucks, agricultural machinery), process emissions (composting, liquid industrial waste), soil emissions (N_2O from vineyard soils), fugitive emissions (refrigerant gases), and fertilizers (N_2O from nitrogen application). Activity data comes from direct purchase records of fuels, fertilizers, and refrigerants. Emission factors are primarily from DEFRA 2022, IPCC 2006 Guidelines, and IPCC AR5 GWPs. For fertilizers, EF1 factor (0.01 kg N_2O-N/kg N applied) was used, adjusted for local practices. Refrigerant emissions were calculated using DEFRA except for R-513A, where supplier-specific data was applied. Reported values cover 100% of winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22115.9

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 is reported using both the location-based and market-based approaches in line with the GHG Protocol. For location-based, country-specific grid emission factors were used: Coordinador Eléctrico Nacional (Chile), Ministerio de Energía (Argentina), and EPA WECC California (U.S.). For market-based, emissions were calculated considering renewable Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), onsite solar generation, and International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs). Contractual instruments were verified by signed agreements and certificates, while I-RECs ensured coverage of all non-renewable grid electricity. This approach guarantees that 100% of the holding's electricity consumption across subsidiaries is from renewable sources, covering operations in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 is reported using both the location-based and market-based approaches in line with the GHG Protocol. For location-based, country-specific grid emission factors were used: Coordinador Eléctrico Nacional (Chile), Ministerio de Energía (Argentina), and EPA WECC California (U.S.). For market-based, emissions were calculated considering renewable Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), onsite solar generation, and International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs). Contractual instruments were verified by signed agreements and certificates, while I-RECs ensured coverage of all non-renewable grid electricity. This approach guarantees that 100% of the holding's electricity consumption across subsidiaries is from renewable sources, covering operations in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

173579.1

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers the upstream emissions associated with the production of goods and services purchased by the company, including agricultural inputs, bulk wine, grapes, packaging materials (glass, cardboard, plastic, aluminum, Tetra Pak, wood), and enological products (such as yeasts, clarifiers, stabilizers, and other winemaking additives). Activity data is obtained directly from procurement records, ensuring full traceability of material volumes and categories acquired during the reporting year. For glass bottles, which represent a significant share of packaging emissions, a supplier-specific emission factor was applied for purchases in Chile, reflecting the production processes and energy mix of local glass manufacturers. For all other materials and enological products, emission factors were sourced primarily from DEFRA 2022 and USEEIO 2022, chosen for their coverage of diverse material categories and international recognition. This methodological approach ensures accurate representation of upstream emissions linked to the company's core inputs, aligning with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain Standard. The

reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, harmonizing data collection and factor application across geographies.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32183

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Includes investments in property, plant, and equipment (PPE): machinery, equipment, construction, infrastructure, vehicles, and vineyard plantings. Calculations used an economic input-output approach with emission factors from USEEIO 2022. Data came from consolidated investment records without thresholds, ensuring coverage of all acquisitions. Reported values cover 100% of winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3250

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Covers upstream emissions from fuel extraction, refining, and transport. Activity data is based on fuel purchase records. Factors from DEFRA 2022 were applied for well-to-tank. Reported values cover 100% of winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14149.9

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category accounts for the upstream transportation of raw materials and purchased inputs, including external grapes, bulk wine, and packaging materials (glass). Activity data was compiled from logistics provider records and complemented with estimations of transport distances, calculated between supplier facilities and the company's production sites in Chile, Argentina, and the United States. Emissions were quantified using DEFRA 2022 emission factors, with differentiation by truck size, load capacity, and fuel type to capture variability in ground transportation. The methodology ensures a comprehensive estimation of upstream freight emissions, reflecting the diversity of supply chains across geographies. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized calculation approach aligned with the GHG Protocol.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1727.8

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers solid waste and wastewater generated at production sites. Data was obtained from internal operational registries, complemented in some countries by official reporting systems. In Chile, for example, waste information is reported to the national platform SINADER, where records are validated by the authorized entities receiving the waste. Emissions were estimated using DEFRA 2022 emission factors for landfill and composting pathways, which represent the primary disposal routes for operational waste. The methodology ensures consistency and transparency across geographies, while reflecting local regulatory validation mechanisms where applicable. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1046.5

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers employee air travel only, as accommodation and land transport are accounted for under Scope 3 – Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services. For subsidiaries in Chile and Argentina, activity data was based on records of kilometers flown, with emissions estimated using DEFRA 2022 emission factors by flight distance. For the United States, where activity data was less detailed, a spend-based approach was applied, using USEEIO 2022 emission factors for air travel services. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2900.9

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers daily commuting of employees across all subsidiaries and commercial offices. As primary commuting data was not fully available, the estimation was carried out using secondary sources and standardized assumptions to ensure a representative and consistent calculation across geographies. The methodology considered the total workforce of each subsidiary and assumed a standard working year adapted to local contexts. Average commuting distances were estimated for each country of operation, differentiated by urban and regional conditions. Modal splits of transport were derived from official national or regional mobility studies, including sources such as Chile's Ministry of the Environment, the World Bank for Mendoza (Argentina), and the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics for California. For commercial offices in other markets, a blended distribution of these datasets was applied. Emissions were calculated using DEFRA 2022 emission factors, applied to each transport mode (car, bus, metro, bicycle, walking, and teleworking). This approach ensured comparability across subsidiaries and reflected the diversity of commuting behaviors in each geography. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, as well as commercial offices, under a harmonized methodological framework aligned with the GHG Protocol.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

81586.1

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers the distribution of bottled and bulk wine from production sites to ports, distribution centers, and final customers across domestic and international markets. Activity data was based on sales volumes and shipping records, complemented with estimations of average transport distances by mode and geography. Emissions were calculated using DEFRA 2022 emission factors, differentiated by road freight (by truck type and load capacity), rail transport, and maritime shipping for long-distance exports. For sea freight, factors for container vessels were applied, reflecting the typical modes used for international wine distribution. This

approach provides a comprehensive representation of distribution-related impacts across the company's value chain, integrating both regional and global logistics pathways. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized methodology aligned with the GHG Protocol.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4210.8

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers the disposal of packaging materials associated with products sold, including glass, cardboard, aluminum, plastics, Tetra Pak, and wood. Activity data was derived from sales records, which provided the number of units sold, and combined with the corresponding packaging weights per unit to estimate the total volume of materials placed on the market. End-of-life emissions were calculated using DEFRA 2022 emission factors for landfill disposal, applied across all packaging types. This conservative approach was selected to avoid underestimation, assuming landfill as the primary end-of-life pathway across the company's main markets. The methodology provides a transparent estimate of downstream impacts linked to packaging waste, harmonized across geographies. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, ensuring full consolidation of operational boundaries under the GHG Protocol.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was assessed under the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard and determined to be not material for the company's value chain. The assessment considered the nature of operations, the structure of the business model, and the relative contribution of this category to the overall greenhouse gas profile. The analysis confirmed that emissions from this category are either negligible in scale compared to other Scope 3 categories, not relevant to the company's products or activities, or would not provide additional insights for strategic decision-making. For example, the company's emissions hotspots are concentrated in raw material supply, packaging, transportation, and end-of-life of packaging — categories already measured and disclosed. By contrast, this category does not generate significant emissions relative to those priorities. Excluding this category ensures that resources are focused on the most relevant parts of the value chain while maintaining consistency, transparency, and completeness in reporting. The decision is consistent with the principle of relevance established in the GHG Protocol and with common practice in the wine sector.
[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)

39287

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are reported for all winemaking subsidiaries — Concha y Toro (Chile), Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States) — under a harmonized methodology that ensures full coverage of direct operational sources. The inventory includes stationary combustion from boilers, generators, and frost control towers; mobile combustion from tractors, forklifts, trucks, and agricultural machinery; process emissions from winemaking activities; soil emissions from nitrogen application in vineyards; fugitive emissions from refrigerants; and emissions from fertilizers. Activity data is derived from direct fuel consumption records, fertilizer purchase data, and refrigerant purchases, which are used to estimate fugitive emissions based on the quantities of gases acquired and applied in operations. Emission factors are drawn from internationally recognized sources to ensure methodological robustness and comparability. For soil and

fertilizer-related nitrous oxide emissions, the methodology applies IPCC 2006 Guidelines together with the most recent IPCC AR6 Global Warming Potentials. For stationary and mobile combustion, DEFRA 2024 factors are used, adjusted for the specific fuel types consumed. Supplier-specific factors are incorporated where available, particularly for refrigerants and specialized fuels, improving accuracy and alignment with actual operational practices. All Scope 1 calculations were carried out in strict alignment with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. The consolidated inventory at the holding level was externally verified by Deloitte, ensuring transparency, credibility, and compliance with international best practice. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States.

Past year 1

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

48338.7

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2023

(7.6.3) Methodological details

For years prior to the adoption of the consolidated methodology in 2024, Scope 1 emissions were recalculated to ensure consistency and comparability across the holding. Because Concha y Toro represents around 70% of the group's total emissions, its verified carbon footprint was used as the anchor dataset to estimate Scope 1 emissions for the other winemaking subsidiaries: Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States). The Scope 1 inventory of Concha y Toro for those years was fully aligned with the 2024 boundary in terms of scope and inclusions, covering stationary combustion (boilers, generators, frost towers), mobile combustion (agricultural machinery, trucks, forklifts), process emissions from winemaking, soil emissions from nitrogen application in vineyards, fugitive emissions from refrigerant use, and fertilizer-related nitrous oxide. This ensured methodological consistency when extrapolating to the rest of the subsidiaries. Extrapolation combined Concha y Toro's detailed activity data with year-specific emission factors from DEFRA and complementary references such as the IPCC Guidelines and supplier-specific data where applicable. This ensured that annual variations in emission factors were captured while maintaining a consistent methodological framework across the group. The exercise was necessary to harmonize Scope 1 emissions across subsidiaries and to build a comparable time series. By anchoring the methodology in Concha y Toro's robust dataset and extending it to all subsidiaries, the holding ensured that Scope 1 reporting for years prior to 2024 is comprehensive, consistent, and technically reliable for monitoring progress toward decarbonization goals.

Past year 2

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

50935.7

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

For years prior to the adoption of the consolidated methodology in 2024, Scope 1 emissions were recalculated to ensure consistency and comparability across the holding. Because Concha y Toro represents around 70% of the group's total emissions, its verified carbon footprint was used as the anchor dataset to estimate Scope 1 emissions for the other winemaking subsidiaries: Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States). The Scope 1 inventory of Concha y Toro for those years was fully aligned with the 2024 boundary in terms of scope and inclusions, covering stationary combustion (boilers, generators, frost towers), mobile combustion (agricultural machinery, trucks, forklifts), process emissions from winemaking, soil emissions from nitrogen application in vineyards, fugitive emissions from refrigerant use, and fertilizer-related nitrous oxide. This ensured methodological consistency when extrapolating to the rest of the subsidiaries. Extrapolation combined Concha y Toro's detailed activity data with year-specific emission factors from DEFRA and complementary references such as the IPCC Guidelines and supplier-specific data where applicable. This ensured that annual variations in emission factors were captured while maintaining a consistent methodological framework across the group. The exercise was necessary to harmonize Scope 1 emissions across subsidiaries and to build a comparable time series. By anchoring the methodology in Concha y Toro's robust dataset and extending it to all subsidiaries, the holding ensured that Scope 1 reporting for years prior to 2024 is comprehensive, consistent, and technically reliable for monitoring progress toward decarbonization goals.
[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)

17866.6

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

0

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are reported for all winemaking subsidiaries — Concha y Toro (Chile), Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States) — under a harmonized methodology that ensures full coverage of indirect emissions from purchased electricity. The inventory includes electricity consumed in wineries, offices, warehouses, and production facilities across all subsidiaries. Scope 2 is calculated using both the location-based method, which

applies country-specific grid emission factors, and the market-based method, which incorporates contractual instruments and certificates that guarantee renewable electricity sourcing. Activity data is derived from electricity purchase records and metered consumption, ensuring complete traceability of energy use across operations. For the location-based calculation, emission factors were taken from official and internationally recognized sources, including the Coordinador Eléctrico Nacional (Chile), the Ministerio de Energía (Argentina), and the EPA's eGRID database (United States), complemented with DEFRA 2024 when relevant. For the market-based approach, emissions were calculated considering Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), onsite photovoltaic generation, and International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs), all of which meet the GHG Protocol criteria for contractual instruments. This dual calculation approach ensures methodological robustness, comparability across subsidiaries, and alignment with global best practice. All Scope 2 calculations were carried out in strict accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance. The consolidated inventory at the holding level was externally verified by Deloitte, ensuring transparency, credibility, and assurance of compliance. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States.

Past year 1

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

18270.1

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

0

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

For years prior to the adoption of the consolidated methodology in 2024, Scope 2 emissions were recalculated to ensure consistency and comparability across the holding. Because Viña Concha y Toro represents around 70% of the group's total emissions, its verified carbon footprint was used as the anchor dataset to estimate Scope 2 emissions for the other winemaking subsidiaries: Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States). The Scope 2 inventory of Concha y Toro for those years was fully aligned with the 2024 boundary in terms of scope and inclusions, reporting emissions under both the location-based method, which applies national grid emission factors, and the market-based method, which incorporates contractual instruments such as renewable Power Purchase Agreements, onsite solar generation, and International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs). This ensured methodological consistency when extrapolating to the rest of the subsidiaries. Extrapolation combined Concha y Toro's detailed electricity consumption data with year-specific grid emission factors from sources such as the Coordinador Eléctrico Nacional (Chile), the Ministerio de Energía (Argentina), the U.S. EPA eGRID database, and DEFRA where applicable. Contractual instruments were also integrated when relevant, ensuring that annual variations in both grid intensity and renewable energy sourcing were captured while maintaining a consistent methodological framework across the group. This exercise was necessary to harmonize Scope 2 emissions across subsidiaries and to build a comparable time series. By anchoring the methodology in Concha y Toro's robust dataset and extending it to all subsidiaries, the holding ensured that Scope 2 reporting for years prior to 2024 is comprehensive, consistent, and technically reliable for monitoring progress toward decarbonization goals.

Past year 2

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

22115.9

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

0

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

For years prior to the adoption of the consolidated methodology in 2024, Scope 2 emissions were recalculated to ensure consistency and comparability across the holding. Because Viña Concha y Toro represents around 70% of the group's total emissions, its verified carbon footprint was used as the anchor dataset to estimate Scope 2 emissions for the other winemaking subsidiaries: Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States). The Scope 2 inventory of Concha y Toro for those years was fully aligned with the 2024 boundary in terms of scope and inclusions, reporting emissions under both the location-based method, which applies national grid emission factors, and the market-based method, which incorporates contractual instruments such as renewable Power Purchase Agreements, onsite solar generation, and International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs). This ensured methodological consistency when extrapolating to the rest of the subsidiaries. Extrapolation combined Concha y Toro's detailed electricity consumption data with year-specific grid emission factors from sources such as the Coordinador Eléctrico Nacional (Chile), the Ministerio de Energía (Argentina), the U.S. EPA eGRID database, and DEFRA where applicable. Contractual instruments were also integrated when relevant, ensuring that annual variations in both grid intensity and renewable energy sourcing were captured while maintaining a consistent methodological framework across the group. This exercise was necessary to harmonize Scope 2 emissions across subsidiaries and to build a comparable time series. By anchoring the methodology in Concha y Toro's robust dataset and extending it to all subsidiaries, the holding ensured that Scope 2 reporting for years prior to 2024 is comprehensive, consistent, and technically reliable for monitoring progress toward decarbonization goals. [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)

191972.2

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Hybrid method

☑ Average data method

☑ Spend-based method

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

35

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions for Category 1 were calculated following the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. The scope was disaggregated into packaging materials, purchased grapes, oenological supplies, agricultural supplies, and services to reflect the company's main sources of upstream emissions. For packaging materials, purchase records were combined with weights and material specifications. For glass bottles, supplier-specific emission factors were applied in Chile, while for cardboard, plastics, aluminum, Tetra Pak, and wood, factors were sourced primarily from DEFRA 2024 and complemented with recognized databases. For purchased grapes, emissions were estimated from volumes acquired externally, using the company's own vineyard intensity as a proxy to ensure comparability between internal and external production. Grapes represent a material component of the footprint, as third-party purchases account for a significant share of the company's raw material needs. For oenological and agricultural supplies, procurement data was used together with emission factors from DEFRA and the IPCC Guidelines, with supplier-specific data applied when available to improve precision. For services, where direct activity data was unavailable, a spend-based approach was applied. Expenditures were converted into emissions using USEEIO 2022 emission factors, ensuring coverage of outsourced professional and operational services. This approach applies a hybrid methodology, combining supplier-specific, activity-based, and spend-based data to maximize accuracy and comparability. Reported values cover 100% of winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized boundary. The category was externally verified at the holding level by Deloitte, ensuring robustness and alignment with international best practice. Category 1 is considered highly material, as packaging, grape purchases, and services together represent a significant share of total Scope 3 emissions.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

13589.7

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions for Category 2 were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. The boundary includes all Properties, Plant, and Equipment (PPE) acquisitions recorded during the reporting year, ensuring full coverage of capital investments across the holding. The following categories were considered: land purchases, construction, electrical and electronic equipment, machinery and equipment, other non-metallic products, vineyard plantations, and vehicles. The calculation is based on financial expenditure data extracted from accounting records, which provide a reliable measure of annual investments in capital goods. A spend-based approach was applied using USEEIO 2022 emission factors, which capture the cradle-to-gate emissions of capital goods, including raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation to the point of use. The scope of this category covers 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, ensuring that all capital investments are included in the corporate boundary. While capital goods emissions represent a smaller share of the total Scope 3 inventory compared to packaging and agricultural supplies, their inclusion strengthens the completeness of the footprint and reflects the scale and intensity of winery and vineyard operations. All calculations were conducted under a harmonized methodology and externally verified by Deloitte at the holding level, ensuring transparency, reliability, and compliance with international best practices. This approach provides a consistent and credible estimate of embodied emissions in long-term assets, enabling comparability across reporting years and reinforcing the company's commitment to comprehensive value chain accounting.

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)

3029.3

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category covers the upstream emissions associated with the extraction, processing, and transport of fossil fuels consumed in operations, excluding electricity. Because the holding's electricity supply is 100% renewable (through PPAs, on-site photovoltaic generation, and I-RECs), no upstream emissions related to purchased electricity are included. The calculation followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying methodologies suitable for heterogeneous investments. It focuses exclusively on diesel, natural gas, gasoline, and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), which are used across vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. These fuels support stationary combustion (boilers, generators, frost control systems) and mobile combustion (tractors, forklifts, trucks, and agricultural machinery). Direct combustion is reported in Scope 1, while Category 3 captures the well-to-tank impacts prior to final use. Activity data was derived from fuel purchase and consumption records across subsidiaries. Emissions were calculated with DEFRA 2024 factors for fossil fuel upstream processes. This approach ensures that regional differences in fuel characteristics and supply chains are reflected while maintaining comparability across all subsidiaries. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized boundary. All calculations were externally verified at the holding level by Deloitte, ensuring transparency, credibility, and alignment with international best practice.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

10063.3

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ 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

This category accounts for the transport of raw materials and inputs from suppliers and vineyards to company facilities, prior to final packaging. It includes mainly the movement of grapes and bulk wine from estates to wineries and bottling plants, as well as the transport of glass to production sites. These flows are classified as upstream because they occur before product distribution to customers, which is covered in Category 9. The calculation followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying methodologies suitable for heterogeneous investments. Emissions were quantified using a physical distance-based approach, expressed as ton·km. Transported weights were derived from operational logistics and supplier records, while distances were estimated using Google Maps shortest-route calculations between origin and destination points. This method reflects the real geography of operations, which extend across large areas in Chile, Argentina, and the United States. Transport modes considered were heavy-duty trucks (primary mode) and a limited share of maritime shipments. DEFRA 2024 emission factors were applied, differentiated by truck size, load, fuel type, and vessel class (>8,000 TEU for maritime), ensuring emissions intensity reflects the characteristics of each movement. Company-controlled logistics (e.g., own fleet for wine transport) were excluded to avoid double counting with Scope 1, and non-material packaging flows other than glass were excluded due to lack of materiality or traceability. Reported values cover 100% of winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized boundary. All calculations were externally verified at the holding level by Deloitte, ensuring credibility and compliance with international best practice.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

741.7

(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

This category includes solid waste streams that are sent to landfill from the company's vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. The calculation followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying methodologies suitable for heterogeneous industrial operations. Waste streams considered include plastics, paper and cardboard, municipal solid waste, and sludge from production and wastewater treatment facilities. Organic residues managed through composting, as well as the treatment and discharge of liquid industrial water, are accounted for under Scope 1 process emissions to avoid double counting. This ensures that Category 5 exclusively reflects landfill disposal pathways. Activity data was obtained from internal registries that quantify waste volumes by type and treatment. In Chile, data is also reported through the National Waste Declaration System (SINADER) and validated by the entities that receive and dispose of the waste, ensuring high traceability. In Argentina and the United States, comparable monitoring systems or regulatory reporting were used, covering all subsidiaries consistently. Emission factors were drawn from DEFRA 2024, focusing exclusively on landfill pathways. Each waste stream was matched to material-specific factors (e.g., plastics, paper, sludge), capturing the distinct degradation profiles and methane-generation potential of landfilled waste. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized boundary. All calculations were externally verified at the holding level by Deloitte, ensuring accuracy, transparency, and compliance with international best practice.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1045.1

(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

This category includes business-related air travel by employees. Accommodation and land transport are excluded from this category and accounted for under services in Category 1 (Purchased Goods and Services), ensuring clear boundaries and avoiding double counting. The calculation followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying methodologies suitable for heterogeneous operations across subsidiaries. For Chile and Argentina, emissions were calculated using a distance-based approach. Flight activity data, including kilometers flown by route, was obtained from internal travel records and agency reports. These data were multiplied by DEFRA 2024 emission factors. For the United States, where detailed flight distance data was not consistently available, a spend-based approach was applied. Expenditures on air travel were converted into emissions using USEEIO 2022 emission factors, ensuring methodological rigor even where primary distance data could not be collected. This hybrid application of methodologies allows consistent treatment of business travel across all subsidiaries while reflecting regional data availability. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, harmonized under a consolidated boundary. All calculations were externally verified at the holding level by Deloitte, ensuring robustness, transparency, and credibility of the reported results.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3213.3

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ 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

The estimation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from employee commuting was addressed using secondary data and reasonable assumptions, given the absence of primary disaggregated information. The objective was to obtain a representative holding-level estimate that reflects the geographic diversity of operations and commuting habits in each country where the company has significant productive or commercial activities. The calculation followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying methodologies suitable for heterogeneous operations. Employees were disaggregated by subsidiary, covering Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra Organic Estates, and global commercial offices. A standard working year of approximately 249 days was assumed, differentiated by country to reflect local labor contexts. Average commuting distances were assigned by region: shorter distances for Chile and Argentina, and longer distances for California, with weighted averages applied to employees in commercial offices located in other countries. Modal splits (private car, public transport such as bus and metro, taxi, bicycle, walking, remote work, and a residual "other" category) were derived from official national or regional sources, including: the Chilean National Environment Survey (2018), a World Bank study on mobility in intermediate cities for Argentina (2023), and the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2023). For commercial offices, an average modal distribution was calculated based on these three main operational countries. Emissions were calculated using DEFRA 2024 emission factors, differentiated by transport mode (e.g., "average car," "average local bus," "regular taxi"), and combined with the number of employees, commuting days, average distance traveled, and modal distribution. This approach ensures methodological consistency and adequately reflects local commuting conditions. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized boundary. All calculations were externally verified at the holding level by Deloitte, ensuring transparency, credibility, and alignment with international best practice.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with upstream leased assets have been evaluated and determined not to be relevant for the operations of Viña Concha y Toro Holding. The company does not rely on leased assets upstream in its value chain in a manner that would generate material emissions outside of those already captured under Scope 1 (direct fuel combustion, process, and fugitive emissions) and Scope 2 (purchased electricity). This conclusion is based on a relevance screening process

conducted under the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, which applies the recommended criteria: Magnitude: Upstream leased assets represent a negligible share of overall operations, with no significant contribution to the holding's emissions profile. Influence: The company has direct operational control over its key production assets (vineyards, cellars, bottling plants, and offices), meaning leased assets are not a significant source of emissions. Stakeholder expectations: No stakeholders (investors, customers, or regulators) have identified this category as material. Risk and opportunity: No risks or mitigation opportunities are associated with leased assets upstream, as the business model prioritizes owned infrastructure. Additionally, upstream leased assets are not part of the company's long-term strategy or operational model. The holding has historically invested in and maintained ownership of its productive facilities and supporting infrastructure, reducing reliance on leased assets that might otherwise need to be included in Scope 3 reporting.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

80865.6

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ 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

This category covers the transport and distribution of finished wine products, bottled and bulk, from wineries and bottling plants to domestic and international distribution centers, customers, and points of sale. It also includes intermediate transfers between facilities, as well as logistics involving leased centers or external bottling plants. The calculation followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. A ton-kilometer (ton·km) approach was applied, combining shipment volumes with estimated transport distances. Distances were derived using Google Maps for road transport and sea-distances.org for maritime flows, based on the shortest commercial routes. Activity data came from internal logistics records, dispatch guides, and export reports. Transport modes included heavy-duty trucks, rail freight, container ships (>8,000 TEU), and exceptional air freight for samples. DEFRA 2024 emission factors were applied, differentiated by mode, vehicle size, and fuel type. Trucking was assumed to operate at full load, reflecting common industry practice. To account for the last-

mile stage, 100 km of additional road transport was conservatively included from destination ports to customers or points of sale. This ensures international distribution reflects realistic downstream logistics impacts. Reported values cover 100% of winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, under a harmonized methodology. Movements by company-owned fleets are excluded to avoid overlap with Scope 1. All calculations were externally verified by Deloitte at the holding level, ensuring transparency and consistency with international best practice.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with the processing of sold products have been evaluated and determined to be not relevant to the operations of Viña Concha y Toro Holding. The company's core business model is vertically integrated, encompassing vineyard management, winemaking, and bottling activities. As a result, finished products are sold in their final form, ready for distribution and consumption, without requiring further industrial processing. Only a very small proportion of wine is sold in bulk to external customers for bottling elsewhere. This share represents a negligible fraction of total production and does not materially affect the company's greenhouse gas emissions profile. Compared to other Scope 3 categories such as packaging, transportation, and purchased agricultural inputs, the contribution from post-sale processing activities is insignificant. The assessment of this category's relevance followed the criteria recommended by the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard: Magnitude: Processing emissions downstream are immaterial when compared to the company's total Scope 3 footprint. Influence: Viña Concha y Toro has no control over the rare instances where customers may process bulk wine, nor is this considered strategically significant. Risk and opportunity: No climate-related risks or mitigation opportunities are linked to this activity. Stakeholder expectations: Stakeholders focus on more material categories, particularly those related to packaging and logistics.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with the use of sold products have been evaluated and determined to be not relevant to the operations of Viña Concha y Toro Holding. The company's products consist exclusively of wine, which does not involve any significant energy or resource consumption during the consumer use phase. Once bottled and distributed, the product is consumed directly without further transformation, industrial processing, or operational requirements that would generate greenhouse

gas emissions attributable to this category. In prior life cycle assessments (LCAs) of white wine products, refrigeration during storage and consumption was considered as a potential downstream source. However, such refrigeration represents indirect and optional energy use according to the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. Furthermore, the scale of these emissions is relatively small when compared to other categories in the company's value chain, such as packaging production or global distribution. The relevance of this category was assessed using the GHG Protocol's recommended screening criteria: Magnitude: Use-phase emissions are immaterial relative to the overall footprint. Influence: The company has no operational or contractual control over how consumers store or consume wine products. Risk and opportunity: No climate-related risks or emission reduction opportunities are associated with product use. Stakeholder expectations: Stakeholders and assurance providers focus on categories with higher materiality, such as packaging and logistics.

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)

4902.8

(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

This category covers the end-of-life treatment of packaging materials placed on the market by the company and its winemaking subsidiaries. Materials included were those most relevant in terms of mass and potential impact: glass, cardboard and paper, plastics, aluminum, wood, and Tetra Pak. Tertiary packaging was excluded due to low materiality. Both domestic sales and exports were included. The methodology followed the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. Sales data by country of destination were used to estimate packaging placed on the market. Average material content per unit (grams per functional unit) was applied to calculate the total kilograms of each packaging material reaching end-of-life. It was assumed that all packaging becomes waste after use. Recycling fractions were deducted ex-ante, using country-specific recycling rates by material from official sources for the main markets, including Chile, Brazil, the United States, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and Japan. For other regions, aggregated global rates for Europe and the rest of the world

were applied. This approach reflects structural differences in recycling infrastructure and consumer behavior across geographies. The remaining fractions were assumed to be disposed of in landfill. DEFRA 2024 emission factors specific to landfill disposal were applied for each material type. Factors for recycling, incineration, or other recovery pathways were not considered, as these fractions had already been excluded from the waste baseline. Boundaries include 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries in Chile, Argentina, and the United States, ensuring full alignment with the consolidated methodology adopted at the holding level. All calculations were externally verified by Deloitte, ensuring methodological rigor, transparency, and comparability with international best practice.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with downstream leased assets have been assessed and determined to be not relevant for Viña Concha y Toro Holding. The company does not lease assets such as production facilities, warehouses, or distribution centers to third parties, and therefore there are no additional emissions generated downstream that would need to be accounted for under this category. This assessment was carried out following the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. Using the recommended relevance screening criteria, the following conclusions were reached: Magnitude: The absence of leased downstream assets means there are no material emissions linked to this category. Influence: The company retains control and ownership of its productive and distribution assets, and leasing downstream is not part of its operational or business model. Risk and opportunity: No climate-related risks or opportunities arise from this category, as it does not form part of the company's activities. Stakeholder expectations: No stakeholders, including investors, customers, or regulators, have identified downstream leased assets as material to the company's carbon footprint.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with franchises are not relevant to Viña Concha y Toro Holding. The company does not grant franchise licenses to other entities for the sale, distribution, or commercialization of its products. All sales and distribution activities are carried out directly through the company's own subsidiaries and established commercial channels, ensuring full operational control. This assessment follows the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. Using the recommended relevance screening criteria, the following conclusions were reached: Magnitude: No franchise operations exist within

the company's structure; therefore, no emissions are generated under this category. Influence: The company's business model does not include franchising, and this is not expected to change in the future. Risk and opportunity: No climate-related risks or mitigation opportunities are associated with franchising, given its absence from current and planned operations. Stakeholder expectations: Stakeholders have not identified franchising as a material aspect of the company's carbon footprint.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with investments have been evaluated and determined to be not relevant for Viña Concha y Toro Holding. While the company maintains a small joint venture in Chile, the scale of this activity is insignificant when compared to the emissions generated by its core winemaking operations across Chile, Argentina, and the United States. This evaluation was conducted under the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying the recommended relevance criteria: Magnitude: The contribution of the joint venture to the overall emissions profile is negligible relative to the holding's consolidated Scope 1, 2, and 3 footprint. Influence: Viña Concha y Toro does not exert operational or financial control over investment-related activities in a way that would make them material to the company's emissions reporting. Risk and opportunity: No significant climate-related risks or emission reduction opportunities are associated with the company's limited investment activities. Stakeholder expectations: Investors, customers, and assurance providers prioritize categories with material influence on emissions, such as packaging, transportation, and purchased agricultural inputs, rather than minor investment activities.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Viña Concha y Toro does not have other relevant upstream emissions for the Scope 3 reporting.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Viña Concha y Toro does not have other relevant downstream emissions for the Scope 3 reporting.
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2023

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

178194.1

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

24134.9

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

3148.2

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

7159.1

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

968.8

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

941.2

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

3814.4

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

53023.3

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

3037.2

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

173579.1

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

32183

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

3252

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

14149.9

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

1727.8

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

1046.5

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

2900.9

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

81586.1

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

4210.8
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:*

	Verification/assurance status
	☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Carbon Footprint Verification Letter - Viña Concha y Toro S.A..pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

2

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Carbon Footprint Verification Letter - Viña Concha y Toro S.A..pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Carbon Footprint Verification Letter - Viña Concha y Toro S.A..pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
☑ Scope 3: Business travel
☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

Carbon Footprint Verification Letter - Viña Concha y Toro S.A..pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

403.46

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.61

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Although total electricity consumption increased slightly (from 75.6 GWh to 77.6 GWh), the proportion of renewable self-generation grew (from 5.8 GWh to 6.5 GWh). This displaced higher-emission grid electricity under the location-based method and reduced Scope 2 emissions by −403.46 tCO_2e. The calculation is based on

applying grid emission factors to the avoided consumption thanks to photovoltaic generation, using DEFRA 2024 and local grid factors. Relative change = −403.46 ÷ 66,608.77 = −0.6057%.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1143.65

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.7

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Reductions were achieved in mobile combustion from agricultural and logistics operations. Tractors, forklifts, trucks, and other vehicles consumed less fuel due to a combination of factors: route optimization in vineyards and logistics, efficiency programs that improved equipment utilization, and renewal of part of the fleet, among others. Additionally, preventive maintenance programs could also help reduced unnecessary fuel consumption. Together, these activities lowered fuel use, cutting emissions by −1,143.65 tCO_2e. Relative change = −1,143.65 ÷ 66,608.77 = −1.7170%.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

645.89

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.97

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

A reduction in agricultural activity reduced nitrous oxide emissions from vineyard soils. In the Concha y Toro subsidiary, productive vineyard hectares declined between reporting years (from 8,168 to 7,643), leading to lower fertilizer application and biological soil activity. This reduced emissions by approximately −1,001.65 tCO_2e. At the same time, slight increases in stationary combustion (+355.76 tCO_2e) due to variations in boiler and frost-control operations offset part of this reduction. Net effect = −1,001.65 + 355.76 = −645.89 tCO_2e. Relative change = −645.89 ÷ 66,608.77 = −0.9697%.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7262.12

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

10.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The largest driver of reduction between reporting years is methodological improvements. For process emissions, the composting of pomace and stems in external facilities, which had previously been included as part of operational emissions, was excluded because these organic residues are sold to third parties and are therefore outside the company's operational control. Additionally, for liquid industrial wastewater (LIW), new emission factors were applied, more accurately reflecting methane and nitrous oxide generation from treatment and discharge processes. For fugitive refrigerants, the accounting basis was modified: previously estimated on a "consumption" approach (difference between starting and ending stock plus top-ups), it was replaced by a "purchases" approach, which better aligns with GHG Protocol recommendations and avoids double-counting, leading to a significant decrease for that particular year. Conversely, for fertilizers, emissions rose as the basis shifted from "consumption" to "purchases," ensuring a more accurate reflection of input use. These three changes combined generated a net reduction of −7,262.12 tCO_2e. The calculation is: Process (−3,693.65) + Fugitive (−5,245.07) + Fertilizers (+1,676.59) = −7,262.12 tCO_2e. Relative change = −7,262.12 ÷ 66,608.77 = −10.9027%.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.13) Is biogenic carbon pertaining to your direct operations relevant to your current CDP climate change disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.13.1) Account for biogenic carbon data pertaining to your direct operations and identify any exclusions.

CO2 emissions from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

5830

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Process-based models

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

The estimation of CO_2 emissions from land use management was carried out in alignment with the FLAG methodology developed by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), focusing exclusively on fossil fuel combustion directly linked to agricultural operations in vineyards. These emissions are treated as FLAG because they are inseparable from the productive management of land, rather than general facility operations. Sources included: Fixed agricultural sources (Scope 1): Diesel and LPG consumed in stationary equipment used in vineyards, such as frost-control towers and generators. Mobile agricultural sources (Scope 1): Tractors, sprayers, forklifts, quad bikes, and other machinery dedicated to vineyard activities such as soil preparation, crop maintenance, harvest, and application of inputs. Vehicles used for logistics or administration were excluded. Methodology: Fuel consumption data was extracted from SAP, using a cost-center allocation method to separate agricultural energy use from non-agricultural operations. Only the fraction directly attributable to vineyard activities was included in FLAG. All other consumption

(winemaking, bottling, refrigeration, transportation, administrative operations) was reported under non-FLAG Scope 1. Quantification applied DEFRA 2024 emission factors for diesel, gasoline, and LPG. No national inventory or regional-specific factors were used; DEFRA was consistently applied across all subsidiaries to ensure comparability. This provides harmonization and methodological robustness across the Chile, Argentina, and U.S. operations.

CO2 removals from land use management

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

14902

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Region-specific emissions factors

☑ Other, please specify :IPCC 2006 Guidelines

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

In line with the FLAG methodology developed by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), this inventory incorporates biogenic CO_2 removals with land storage as part of the operational balance of Viña Concha y Toro. These removals are not carbon credits or offsets but represent physical carbon sequestration achieved through the direct management of the company's natural assets. During the reporting year, the company accounted for 14,902 metric tons of CO_2 removals, entirely attributable to Concha y Toro subsidiary lands. These derive from 4,272 hectares of vegetated cover under FSC-certified sustainable forest management, including: ~3,300 hectares of forest areas (plantations, native forest, and mixed forest), and ~900 hectares of prairies and shrublands. All areas comply with the FAO international forest definition and are geo-referenced within company-owned agricultural and natural properties, ensuring traceability and permanence. Methodology: The quantification of carbon removals was based on recognized international and national references: For forest ecosystems: annual growth rates by forest type, biomass expansion factors, root-to-shoot ratios, and carbon fractions were applied according to the Chilean National GHG Inventory (INGEI, 1990–2022, published December 2024) and IPCC 2006 Guidelines (Vol. 4, Ch. 4). For prairies and shrublands: INGEI methodologies were complemented with guidance from the Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIA, 2023) on farm-level carbon balance. Estimates were adjusted conservatively relative to national inventory values. All calculations reflect annual net carbon uptake in above- and below-ground biomass, expressed in CO_2 equivalents through stoichiometric conversion. No additional correction factors or optimistic assumptions were applied, ensuring conservative results. Exclusions: Soil carbon sequestration was not included in this cycle due to methodological constraints, though future improvements aim to incorporate sequestration from agricultural soils. No market transactions or offset claims are associated with these removals.

Sequestration during land use change

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

No land-use change (LUC) events occurred during the reporting year within the operations of Viña Concha y Toro or its winemaking subsidiaries (Cono Sur, Trivento, and Bonterra). The company's agricultural and natural areas have been stable, with no conversion of forest, shrubland, grassland, or other ecosystems to vineyards, infrastructure, or alternative uses. Likewise, no reclassifications of land to forest or agricultural use were made that could generate additional carbon sequestration entries. In accordance with the FLAG methodology developed by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) and the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, only biogenic fluxes associated with land-use management and land-use change are to be reported when they are material and verifiable. Because no LUC took place, sequestration related to this category is considered non-applicable (0 tCO_2).

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (land machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Viña Concha y Toro and its winemaking subsidiaries (Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra) did not use biofuels in agricultural land machinery during the reporting year. All vineyard operations — including tractors, sprayers, frost-control towers, and support vehicles — relied exclusively on fossil fuels (diesel, gasoline, LPG, and natural gas) and electrical energy. Importantly, the electricity consumed in land operations originates 100% from renewable sources, and thus does not contribute to biogenic CO_2 emissions. In line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, and the FLAG methodology developed by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), only emissions from biofuel combustion are to be reported under this type of biogenic CO_2 change. Since no biofuels were used in land operations, the reported value is 0 tCO_2.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (processing/manufacturing machinery)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Within winemaking, bottling, refrigeration, and cellar operations across all subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra), no biofuels were used in processing or manufacturing equipment. Energy inputs were limited to fossil fuels (e.g., diesel, LPG, natural gas) and electricity from 100% renewable sources, already accounted for under Scope 1 and Scope 2 inventories. According to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, and the FLAG methodology of the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), emissions under this type of biogenic CO_2 change only arise from biofuel combustion in stationary equipment. Since no such fuels were used, the reported value is 0 tCO_2.

CO2 emissions from biofuel combustion (other)

(7.13.1.1) Emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

(7.13.1.2) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Not applicable

(7.13.1.3) Please explain

Viña Concha y Toro does not use biofuels in downstream logistics, distribution, or administrative operations. Transportation activities rely on fossil fuels (e.g., diesel, gasoline) for third-party logistics providers and company-owned fleets, which are already included in Scope 1 and Scope 3 inventories. Electricity use in offices and warehouses is fully covered by renewable energy sources, resulting in no biogenic CO_2 emissions. In line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, the GHG

Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, and the FLAG methodology of the SBTi, emissions from this type of biogenic CO_2 change would only apply if biofuels were combusted in distribution or auxiliary operations. Since no biofuels were consumed, the reported value is 0 tCO_2.
[Fixed row]

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Other commodity

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:
☑ Unit of production

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.1562

(7.14.4) Denominator: unit of production

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(7.14.6) Please explain

Viña Concha y Toro calculates greenhouse gas emissions associated with grape production as it is the key agricultural commodity for our business. The boundary covers all winemaking subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, and Bonterra Organic Estates) and includes agricultural operations directly managed by the company. Emissions sources considered are mobile combustion (tractors and agricultural machinery), stationary combustion (frost control towers, pumps, generators), fertilizers, soil emissions from nitrogen application, and electricity consumption. These categories are directly linked to vineyard production activities and represent the most material contributors to agricultural emissions. The calculation methodology follows the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, using DEFRA 2024 factors, IPCC 2006 Guidelines, IPCC AR6 Global Warming Potentials, and regional energy emission factors by country. The total emissions for each subsidiary's agricultural operations are divided by the quantity of own grapes delivered to winemaking facilities, resulting in an emission factor expressed in kg CO_2e per kg of grape. This factor is then applied to estimate the carbon footprint of grapes purchased from third-party growers. The approach is robust and representative, as technical advisors from the company work directly with grape suppliers to replicate the same agronomic practices applied in owned vineyards, reducing variability between internal and external production. As such, the emission factor remains stable year to year, since the main sources included are structurally linked to grape cultivation practices rather than short-term fluctuations.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

15411.4

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CH4

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

852.4

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

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

16890.2

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ HFCs

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

6133

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

[Add row]

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

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Argentina	*3091.3*	*5376*	*0*
Chile	*34363.3*	*11574.8*	*0*
United States of America	*1832.4*	*915.9*	*0*

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By activity

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Concha y Toro Chile*	*31177.9*
Row 2	*Cono Sur*	*3185.4*
Row 3	*Trivento*	*3091.3*
Row 4	*Bonterra*	*1832.4*

[Add row]

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

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Agricultural (vineyards)*	*22720.3*
Row 2	*Enology (wine cellars)*	*11678.8*
Row 3	*Operations (bottling plants + logistics)*	*4887.9*

[Add row]

(7.18) Do you include emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) in your direct operations as part of your global gross Scope 1 figure?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.18.1) Select the form(s) in which you are reporting your agricultural/forestry emissions.

Select from:
☑ Total emissions

(7.18.2) Report the Scope 1 emissions pertaining to your business activity(ies) and explain any exclusions. If applicable, disaggregate your agricultural/forestry by GHG emissions category.

Row 1

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:
☑ Agriculture/Forestry

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22720.3

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Default emissions factor
☑ Process-based models

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Scope 1 agricultural emissions include stationary combustion (anti-frost towers, irrigation pumps, minor fixed equipment), mobile combustion (tractors, sprayers, harvesters, quads), fertilizer use, and soil N_2O emissions from managed vineyards. Data was obtained through SAP cost center allocation to isolate vineyard-related energy and input consumption from non-agricultural operations across all subsidiaries: Concha y Toro and Cono Sur in Chile, Trivento in Argentina, and Bonterra Organic Estates in the United States. Stationary and mobile combustion emissions were calculated using DEFRA 2024 emission factors, differentiated by fuel type (diesel, LPG, gasoline, natural gas). Fertilizer and soil-related N_2O emissions were estimated following IPCC 2006 Guidelines (Volume 4, Agriculture) and IPCC AR6 Global Warming Potentials. The soil methodology accounts for both direct emissions from nitrogen inputs and indirect pathways (volatilization, leaching). Only energy and input consumption directly linked to agricultural production were included. Small experimental plots and non-productive lands were excluded as immaterial. The calculation follows the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, and applies the FLAG methodology of the Science Based

Targets initiative to ensure correct treatment of land-related emissions. The reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries and are externally verified at holding level by Deloitte, ensuring completeness, transparency, and methodological robustness.

Row 2

(7.18.2.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Processing/Manufacturing

(7.18.2.3) Emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16566.7

(7.18.2.4) Methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Default emissions factor

(7.18.2.5) Please explain

Scope 1 emissions from processing and manufacturing include stationary combustion in wineries and bottling plants (boilers, generators, heating systems), mobile combustion for internal logistics (forklifts, trucks moving wine between facilities), fugitive refrigerant emissions, process emissions from winemaking (fermentation CO_2, composting), and wastewater treatment (liquid industrial waste). Activity data comes from direct fuel purchase and consumption records, refrigerant purchase logs, composting and wastewater treatment reports, and internal operational data across all subsidiaries: Concha y Toro and Cono Sur in Chile, Trivento in Argentina, and Bonterra Organic Estates in the United States. For combustion, DEFRA 2024 factors were applied by fuel type, supplemented by supplier-specific factors when available. Fugitive emissions were estimated from refrigerant purchases, following GHG Protocol guidance. Wastewater emissions were calculated using the IPCC 2006 Guidelines for methane and nitrous oxide. Organic waste composted in external facilities was excluded to avoid double counting, consistent with GHG Protocol treatment. The methodology ensures harmonized boundaries and comparability across all operations. No significant emission sources were excluded, with only immaterial contributions (<0.5%) left out. All calculations follow the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, and integrate land-sector guidance where applicable. Reported values cover 100% of the winemaking subsidiaries and are externally verified by Deloitte at holding level, ensuring methodological consistency and credibility.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By activity

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Concha y Toro Chile*	*10467.9*	*0*
Row 2	*Cono Sur*	*1106.9*	*0*
Row 3	*Trivento*	*5376*	*0*
Row 4	*Bonterra*	*915.9*	*0*

[Add row]

(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	*Agricultural (vineyards)*	*6756.2*	*0*
Row 2	*Enology (wine cellars)*	*8449.6*	*0*
Row 3	*Operations (bottling plants + logistics)*	*2660.9*	*0*

[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)

39287

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

17866.6

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

These emissions include all subsidiaries of Viña Concha y Toro: Concha y Toro Chile, Cono Sur, Trivento, and Bonterra.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

The consolidated accounting group includes all entities under Viña Concha y Toro.
[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:
☑ Yes

(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Concha y Toro Chile

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Alcoholic beverages

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31177.9

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

10467.9

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

No comment.

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Cono Sur

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Alcoholic beverages

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3185.4

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

1106.9

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

No comment.

Row 3

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Trivento

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Alcoholic beverages

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3091.3

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

5376

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

No comment.

Row 4

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Bonterra

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Alcoholic beverages

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1832.4

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

915.9

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

No comment.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Walmart, Inc.

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

12792895

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1851.5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Main sources directly controlled by the company: Stationary combustion: boilers, generators, and frost-control towers (fuels: diesel, LPG, natural gas). Mobile combustion: tractors, forklifts, harvest machinery, and internal logistics fleet. Agricultural soils: nitrous oxide (N_2O) from nitrogen fertilizer application and vineyard management. Fertilizers: both synthetic and organic fertilizers, accounted for under IPCC methodology. Fugitive emissions: leakage from refrigerant gases in cooling and storage systems. Process emissions: fermentation of wine, composting of organic residues, and wastewater treatment and discharge of liquid industrial waste.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Scope 1 inventory was developed following the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and covers 100% of winemaking subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra), under an operational control boundary. All results were externally verified by Deloitte. The identification of Scope 1 sources was conducted through the internal accounting of fuel consumption, agricultural inputs, refrigerant purchases, and process-related activities. The main categories include: stationary combustion in boilers, generators and frost-control towers; mobile combustion in tractors, forklifts, and internal vehicles; fugitive emissions from refrigerant gases; process emissions from winemaking and wastewater treatment; and agricultural emissions from soils and fertilizer application. Soil emissions and fertilizer-related N_2O were included in alignment with the FLAG framework. Assumptions and methods: Emission factors were taken from DEFRA 2024 and complemented with IPCC guidelines where required. For refrigerants, emissions were estimated based on purchases rather than consumption, reflecting a methodological improvement. Wastewater treatment applied updated emission factors for liquid industrial waste. Allocation between agricultural and non-agricultural activities was based on cost center assignments in SAP. Limitations: The main limitations are uncertainties in soil and fertilizer-related N_2O emission factors, lack of direct measurement of small combustion sources, and gaps in historic refrigerant stock data. For small-scale sources with immaterial contribution, estimates were conservatively excluded.

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

Scope 1 emissions were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, under an operational control boundary covering all winemaking subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). The consolidated inventory was verified by Deloitte. Primary data came from direct fuel consumption records, fertilizer purchase data, refrigerant purchases, and activity records from vineyards and wineries. These represent the majority of Scope 1 activity data. Published sources were used to transform this activity data into emissions: DEFRA 2024 emissions factors: applied to stationary and mobile combustion (diesel, gasoline, LPG, natural gas), refrigerants, and other fuel-related sources. IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories and IPCC AR6 Global Warming Potentials: applied to soil N_2O emissions from nitrogen fertilizer application and process emissions from winemaking. National references (e.g., Chilean INGEI) were consulted for FLAG-related categories but the core emission factors applied in Scope 1 reporting were DEFRA and IPCC.

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Walmart, Inc.

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

12792895

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

842

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity: for vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. Electricity-related emissions (calculated under both location-based and market-based approaches, per GHG Protocol). Significant share of demand is met by: On-site solar PV plants in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S. Long-term renewable PPAs and I-RECs, covering 100% of non-renewable consumption in subsidiaries.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Scope 2 inventory was prepared in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). Results were externally verified by Deloitte. Both location-based and market-based approaches were applied. Scope 2 emissions were identified by compiling electricity consumption data from all sites (vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices) based on invoices and meter records. The methodology accounted for on-site solar generation, renewable PPAs, and I-REC purchases, consistent with the GHG Protocol's market-based hierarchy. Assumptions and methods: For location-based calculations, national grid factors were applied. For market-based reporting, supplier certificates and I-RECs were used, ensuring alignment by period and market boundary. Pro-rata allocation was applied where billing cycles straddled reporting years. Limitations: The main challenges include gaps in sub-metering at some facilities, temporal mismatches in certificate issuance, and updates in national grid emission factors that may occur after the reporting period. Despite these, the boundary and coverage ensure complete representation of subsidiaries' Scope 2 emissions.

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

Scope 2 emissions were calculated in line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries. Both location-based and market-based methods were applied. Results were externally verified by Deloitte. Primary data came from electricity bills, supplier certificates, and internal metering, covering vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. Published sources include: National grid emission factors: where published, for Chile, Argentina, and the US, to ensure accuracy. GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance: for applying the market-based hierarchy to PPAs, on-site solar generation, and I-RECs.

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Walmart, Inc.

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

12792895

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity: for vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. Electricity-related emissions (calculated under both location-based and market-based approaches, per GHG Protocol). Significant share of demand is met by: On-site solar PV plants in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S. Long-term renewable PPAs and I-RECs, covering 100% of non-renewable consumption in subsidiaries.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Scope 2 inventory was prepared in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). Results were externally verified by Deloitte. Both location-based and market-based approaches were applied. Scope 2 emissions were identified by compiling electricity consumption data from all sites (vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices) based on invoices and meter records. The methodology accounted for on-site solar generation, renewable PPAs, and I-REC purchases, consistent with the GHG Protocol's market-based hierarchy. Assumptions and methods: For location-based calculations, national grid factors were applied. For market-based reporting, supplier certificates and I-RECs were used, ensuring alignment by period and market boundary. Pro-rata allocation was applied where billing cycles straddled reporting years. Limitations: The main challenges include gaps in sub-metering at some facilities, temporal mismatches in certificate issuance, and updates in national grid emission factors that may occur after the reporting period. Despite these, the boundary and coverage ensure complete representation of subsidiaries' Scope 2 emissions.

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

Scope 2 emissions were calculated in line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries. Both location-based and market-based methods were applied. Results were externally verified by Deloitte. Primary data came from electricity bills, supplier certificates, and internal metering, covering vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. Published sources include: National grid emission factors: where published, for Chile, Argentina, and the US, to ensure accuracy. GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance: for applying the market-based hierarchy to PPAs, on-site solar generation, and I-RECs.

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Walmart, Inc.

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

12792895

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

14582.7

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Key categories relevant and material to the company: Purchased goods and services (Category 1): - Packaging materials (glass bottles, cardboard, aluminum, Tetra Pak, plastics). - Purchased grapes (≈35% of total grapes used). - Oenological and agricultural supplies. - Services (estimated with spend-based method using USEEIO 2022). Capital goods (Category 2): emissions linked to construction and equipment for vineyards, wineries, and bottling facilities. Fuel- and energy-related activities (Category 3): extraction, refining, and transport of fuels purchased. Upstream transportation and distribution (Category 4): inbound logistics for grapes, wines and glass. Waste generated in operations (Category 5): solid waste sent to landfill (plastics, paper, cardboard, sludge, municipal waste). Business travel (Category 6): flights by employees. Employee commuting (Category 7): emissions estimated from commuting patterns, distances, and transport modes. Downstream transportation and distribution (Category 9): international and domestic distribution of bottled and bulk wine (truck, rail, ship). End-of-life treatment of sold products (Category 12): disposal of packaging materials after consumption, adjusted for country-specific recycling rates.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 3 was calculated in line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying an operational control boundary and including all winemaking subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). The consolidated inventory was verified by Deloitte. The identification of Scope 3 categories followed the Protocol's relevance criteria (magnitude, influence, risk, stakeholder interest). Nine categories were considered relevant and calculated: Cat 1 Purchased goods and services: packaging (supplier-specific data for glass), purchased grapes (own footprint applied to purchased volumes), enological and agricultural supplies, and services (spend-based with USEEIO 2022). Cat 2 Capital goods: calculated using spend and DEFRA factors. Cat 3 Fuel- and energy-related activities: included only fossil fuels (diesel, gasoline, LPG, natural gas), as purchased electricity is renewable. Cat 4 Upstream transportation: calculated on a distance-based ton-km approach, using internal logistics records and DEFRA 2024 factors. Cat 5 Waste generated: only waste sent to landfill, including paper, plastics, sludge, and general waste. Composting and wastewater treatment are included in Scope 1. Cat 6 Business travel: calculated through distance-based and spend-based methods, applying DEFRA 2024 and USEEIO 2022. Cat 7 Employee commuting: estimated using HR headcounts, official modal shares from Chile, Argentina, and the US, average distances, and DEFRA 2024 transport factors. Cat 9 Downstream transportation: calculated with ton-km approach, including conservative last-mile assumptions. Cat 12 End-of-life packaging: sales-based calculation, applying material masses per unit, national recycling rates, and DEFRA 2024 landfill factors. Assumptions and methods: DEFRA 2024 factors were the main source; regional adjustments were applied when available. For packaging, recycled fractions were excluded ex-ante. For commuting, official transport statistics substituted for surveys. For services, USEEIO 2022 spend-based factors were used. Limitations: Limited primary data from some suppliers, reliance on spend-based methods for services, variability in last-mile logistics, and heterogeneity of national waste/recycling infrastructure. Non-relevant categories (8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15) were documented with justifications.

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

Scope 3 was developed in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries. The consolidated inventory was externally verified by Deloitte. Primary data sources included supplier-specific data for glass packaging, internal logistics records (dispatch guides, export reports), sales data for packaging end-of-life, HR data for employee commuting, and purchase data for grapes and other agricultural supplies. Published secondary data sources were used extensively: DEFRA 2024 emissions factors: applied to packaging (by material type), logistics (truck, rail, sea, air), fuel- and energy-related activities, waste to landfill, business travel, and commuting (modal emission factors). IPCC Guidelines: applied for agricultural inputs and soil-related emission profiles. USEEIO 2022: applied to spend-based calculations for services and business travel where direct activity data was unavailable. National recycling statistics: applied to estimate packaging end-of-life, including Chile, Brazil, US, UK, Mexico, Japan, and global averages. Official transport statistics: Chile (Encuesta Nacional de Medio Ambiente 2018), Argentina (World Bank study on intermediate cities 2023), US (Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2023) for employee commuting modal shares.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Ahold Delhaize

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

5712556

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

826.8

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Main sources directly controlled by the company: Stationary combustion: boilers, generators, and frost-control towers (fuels: diesel, LPG, natural gas). Mobile combustion: tractors, forklifts, harvest machinery, and internal logistics fleet. Agricultural soils: nitrous oxide (N_2O) from nitrogen fertilizer application and vineyard management. Fertilizers: both synthetic and organic fertilizers, accounted for under IPCC methodology. Fugitive emissions: leakage from refrigerant gases in cooling and storage systems. Process emissions: fermentation of wine, composting of organic residues, and wastewater treatment and discharge of liquid industrial waste.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Scope 1 inventory was developed following the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and covers 100% of winemaking subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra), under an operational control boundary. All results were externally verified by Deloitte. The identification of Scope 1 sources was conducted through the internal accounting of fuel consumption, agricultural inputs, refrigerant purchases, and process-related activities. The main categories include: stationary combustion in boilers, generators and frost-control towers; mobile combustion in tractors, forklifts, and internal vehicles; fugitive emissions from refrigerant gases; process emissions from winemaking and wastewater treatment; and agricultural emissions from soils and fertilizer application. Soil emissions and fertilizer-related N_2O were included in alignment with the FLAG framework. Assumptions and methods: Emission factors were taken from DEFRA 2024 and complemented with IPCC guidelines where required. For refrigerants, emissions were estimated based on purchases rather than consumption, reflecting a methodological improvement. Wastewater treatment applied updated emission factors for liquid industrial waste. Allocation between agricultural and non-agricultural activities was based on cost center assignments in SAP. Limitations: The main limitations are uncertainties in soil and fertilizer-related N_2O emission factors, lack of direct measurement of small combustion sources, and gaps in historic refrigerant stock data. For small-scale sources with immaterial contribution, estimates were conservatively excluded.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Ahold Delhaize

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

5712554

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

376

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity: for vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. Electricity-related emissions (calculated under both location-based and market-based approaches, per GHG Protocol). Significant share of demand is met by: On-site solar PV plants in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S. Long-term renewable PPAs and I-RECs, covering 100% of non-renewable consumption in subsidiaries.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Scope 2 inventory was prepared in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). Results were externally verified by Deloitte. Both location-based and market-based approaches were applied. Scope 2 emissions were identified by compiling electricity consumption data from all sites (vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices) based on invoices and meter records. The methodology accounted for on-site solar generation, renewable PPAs, and I-REC purchases, consistent with the GHG Protocol's market-based hierarchy. Assumptions and methods: For location-based calculations, national grid factors were applied. For market-based reporting, supplier certificates and I-RECs were used, ensuring alignment by period and market boundary. Pro-rata allocation was applied where billing cycles straddled reporting years. Limitations: The main challenges include gaps in sub-metering at some facilities, temporal mismatches in certificate issuance, and updates in national grid emission factors that may occur after the reporting period. Despite these, the boundary and coverage ensure complete representation of subsidiaries' Scope 2 emissions.

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Ahold Delhaize

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

5712556

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Purchased electricity: for vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices. Electricity-related emissions (calculated under both location-based and market-based approaches, per GHG Protocol). Significant share of demand is met by: On-site solar PV plants in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S. Long-term renewable PPAs and I-RECs, covering 100% of non-renewable consumption in subsidiaries.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Scope 2 inventory was prepared in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Scope 2 Guidance, under an operational control boundary covering all subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). Results were externally verified by Deloitte. Both location-based and market-based approaches were applied. Scope 2 emissions were identified by compiling electricity consumption data from all sites (vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, and offices)

based on invoices and meter records. The methodology accounted for on-site solar generation, renewable PPAs, and I-REC purchases, consistent with the GHG Protocol's market-based hierarchy. Assumptions and methods: For location-based calculations, national grid factors were applied. For market-based reporting, supplier certificates and I-RECs were used, ensuring alignment by period and market boundary. Pro-rata allocation was applied where billing cycles straddled reporting years. Limitations: The main challenges include gaps in sub-metering at some facilities, temporal mismatches in certificate issuance, and updates in national grid emission factors that may occur after the reporting period. Despite these, the boundary and coverage ensure complete representation of subsidiaries' Scope 2 emissions.

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Ahold Delhaize

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods

☑ Category 6: Business travel

☑ Category 7: Employee commuting

☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the volume of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Liters

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

5712556

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6511.8

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Key categories relevant and material to the company: Purchased goods and services (Category 1): - Packaging materials (glass bottles, cardboard, aluminum, Tetra Pak, plastics). - Purchased grapes (≈35% of total grapes used). - Oenological and agricultural supplies. - Services (estimated with spend-based method using USEEIO 2022). Capital goods (Category 2): emissions linked to construction and equipment for vineyards, wineries, and bottling facilities. Fuel- and energy-related activities (Category 3): extraction, refining, and transport of fuels purchased. Upstream transportation and distribution (Category 4): inbound logistics for grapes, wines and glass. Waste generated in operations (Category 5): solid waste sent to landfill (plastics, paper, cardboard, sludge, municipal waste). Business travel (Category 6): flights by employees. Employee commuting (Category 7): emissions estimated from commuting patterns, distances, and transport modes. Downstream transportation and distribution (Category 9): international and domestic distribution of bottled and bulk wine (truck, rail, ship). End-of-life treatment of sold products (Category 12): disposal of packaging materials after consumption, adjusted for country-specific recycling rates.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 3 was calculated in line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard, applying an operational control boundary and including all winemaking subsidiaries (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra). The consolidated inventory was verified by Deloitte. The identification of Scope 3 categories followed the Protocol's relevance criteria (magnitude, influence, risk, stakeholder interest). Nine categories were considered relevant and calculated: Cat 1 Purchased goods and services: packaging (supplier-specific data for glass), purchased grapes (own footprint applied to purchased volumes), enological and agricultural supplies, and services (spend-based with USEEIO 2022). Cat 2 Capital goods: calculated using spend and DEFRA factors. Cat 3 Fuel- and energy-related activities: included only fossil fuels (diesel, gasoline, LPG, natural gas), as purchased electricity is renewable. Cat 4 Upstream transportation: calculated on a distance-based ton-km approach, using internal logistics records and DEFRA 2024 factors. Cat 5 Waste generated: only waste sent to landfill, including paper, plastics, sludge, and general waste. Composting and wastewater treatment are included in Scope 1. Cat 6 Business travel: calculated through distance-based and spend-based methods, applying DEFRA 2024 and USEEIO 2022. Cat 7 Employee commuting: estimated using HR headcounts, official modal shares from Chile, Argentina, and the US, average distances, and DEFRA 2024 transport factors. Cat 9 Downstream transportation: calculated with ton-km approach, including conservative last-mile assumptions. Cat 12 End-of-life packaging: sales-based calculation, applying material masses per unit, national recycling rates, and DEFRA 2024 landfill factors. Assumptions and methods: DEFRA 2024 factors were the main source; regional adjustments were applied when available. For packaging, recycled fractions were excluded ex-ante. For commuting, official transport statistics substituted for surveys. For services, USEEIO 2022 spend-based factors were used. Limitations: Limited primary data from some suppliers, reliance on spend-based methods for services, variability in last-mile logistics, and heterogeneity of national waste/recycling infrastructure. Non-relevant categories (8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15) were documented with justifications.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

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

The portfolio includes bottled wines, bulk shipments, and multiple packaging formats. Each format carries a distinct footprint, mainly associated with packaging materials such as glass and cardboard. Modeling full life cycles at SKU level is resource-intensive and often impractical. A practical solution is to allocate emissions

only for packaging materials (glass and cardboard) per product, while the remaining emission sources are treated as transversal across all products, excluding distribution since it scales directly with weight.

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ Customer base is too large and diverse to accurately track emissions to the customer level

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

Exports reach over 130 markets through distributors, retailers, and importers. Tracing emissions per customer is highly complex and cost-ineffective. To address this, emissions are allocated using sales volumes as the basis, independent of the destination country. Distances are not differentiated, even though they influence transport emissions. Instead, an average emission factor per functional unit (liter of wine) is applied, ensuring consistency and practicality without excessive granularity.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

Viña Concha y Toro already has the capability to allocate emissions to customers based on product sales volumes or number of units sold. This provides a baseline system that ensures transparency and allows customers to understand the relative carbon intensity of the products they purchase. Looking forward, the company recognizes the importance of developing more detailed and structured allocation methodologies that align more closely with market realities. The aim is to differentiate between cases where emissions should be allocated specifically at the product level versus cases where average intensities are more appropriate. For example, product-specific allocations will be applied to categories with high material relevance such as packaging, where bottle weights and cardboard volumes can be directly linked to individual SKUs. Similarly, transport emissions can be refined by incorporating distances from production sites to key destination markets, enabling more precise estimates of logistics-related emissions. By contrast, certain inputs such as agricultural and oenological supplies present significant challenges

for product-level allocation due to their diffuse and shared nature across multiple vineyards, facilities, and product lines. For these sources, which are less material in the overall carbon footprint, Viña Concha y Toro plans to continue using averages at a transversal level, distributing emissions proportionally across products.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

67247

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

67247.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

71145.6

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

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

71145.60

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

6501.5

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

6501.50

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

77647.1

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

67247

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

144894.10
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No consumption

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No consumption

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No consumption

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No consumption

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

31555.1

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

1741.2

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

29813.9

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Consumption of Diesel

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5581.5

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

0

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

5581.5

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Consumption of Gasoline

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

30110.4

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

0

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

30110.4

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Consumption of LPG and Natural Gas

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

67247

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

1741.2

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

65505.8

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Total consumption of Diesel, Gasoline, LPG and Natural Gas
[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)

6501.5

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

6501.5

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

6501.5

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

6501.5

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Chile

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Direct line to an off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :WIND POWER PLANTS, PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER PLANTS, RESERVOIR HYDROELECTRIC POWER PLANTS, and RUN-OF-THE-RIVER HYDROELECTRIC POWER PLANTS

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

42703

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ Chile

(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)

2014

(7.30.14.10) Comment

In Chile, Concha y Toro and Cono Sur maintain a long-term Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) with renewable energy attributes signed with Colbún S.A. (utility company). This agreement covers the company's largest facilities — those with an installed capacity greater than 500 kW — which, under Chilean law, are entitled to negotiate their electricity supply contracts directly with generators. Since 2017, the facilities meeting this threshold in Chile (Concha y Toro and Cono Sur) have sourced their electricity under this PPA. Colbún S.A. operates a diversified renewable generation mix that includes more than 20 power plants, such as wind farms, photovoltaic parks, storage hydropower, and run-of-river hydropower plants. The emission factor used for reporting purposes was provided directly by Colbún and is 0 tCO_2/MWh, reflecting the renewable origin of the energy supplied and the inclusion of its environmental attributes in the agreement.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Chile

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

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

14569.4

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

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

Select from:
☑ Chile

(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)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Since 2022, Viña Concha y Toro has implemented the purchase of International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs) at the holding company level as a strategy to mitigate the fraction of non-renewable electricity and move toward a more sustainable management model. This measure has made it possible to establish a corporate energy traceability system applicable to all its subsidiaries, strengthening the credibility of its climate commitments. In 2024, the company acquired 24,000 I-RECs from La Flor Wind Farm in Chile, incorporating a safety delta to ensure full coverage of non-renewable electricity consumption. Thanks to this action, subsidiaries such as Trivento achieved a 100% supply from clean sources, consolidating concrete progress in the company's energy transition. The systematic adoption of I-RECs reflects Viña Concha y Toro's commitment to decarbonization and environmental innovation, positioning it as a benchmark for sustainability within the wine industry.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

9264.7

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ I-REC

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

Select from:

☑ Chile

(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)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Since 2022, Viña Concha y Toro has implemented the purchase of International Renewable Energy Certificates (I-RECs) at the holding company level as a strategy to mitigate the fraction of non-renewable electricity and move toward a more sustainable management model. This measure has made it possible to establish a corporate energy traceability system applicable to all its subsidiaries, strengthening the credibility of its climate commitments. In 2024, the company acquired 24,000 I-RECs from La Flor Wind Farm in Chile, incorporating a safety delta to ensure full coverage of non-renewable electricity consumption. Thanks to this action, subsidiaries such as Trivento achieved a 100% supply from clean sources, consolidating concrete progress in the company's energy transition. The systematic adoption of I-RECs reflects Viña Concha y Toro's commitment to decarbonization and environmental innovation, positioning it as a benchmark for sustainability within the wine industry.

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Direct line to an off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar, Wind, Biogas, Geothermal, Small Hydro

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

4608.4

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ 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)

2010

(7.30.14.10) Comment

In the United States, Bonterra Organic Estates sources 100% renewable electricity through a supply agreement with 3 Phases Renewables. Under California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), all retail electricity providers are required to supply a minimum share of renewable power, which in 2024 was set at 44%. To meet Bonterra's voluntary commitment to operate fully on renewable electricity, 3 Phases Renewables delivered power that included the mandated 44% renewable share plus an additional 56% from renewable sources, ensuring that the total supply reached 100% renewable energy. The additional renewable electricity was procured and certified under the Green-e® Energy program, providing third-party assurance of its renewable attributes. Furthermore, the supply mix included New Renewables, defined as generation facilities that commenced commercial operation within the past 15 years, reinforcing the environmental integrity of the procurement. For the purpose of greenhouse gas accounting, the emission factor applied to this supply is 0 tCO_2/MWh, reflecting the renewable nature of the electricity and its verified attributes.
[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9264.7

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

457.9

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

0

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

0

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

9722.60

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

57272.5

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

6043.7

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

0

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

0

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

63316.20

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4608.4

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

4608.40
[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

0.00004066

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

39287

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

966243956

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

20.4

(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

☑ Change in methodology

(7.45.9) Please explain

The Scope 1 and 2 emissions intensity of Viña Concha y Toro Holding decreased significantly from 0.00005107 tCO_2e/unit revenue in 2023 (recalculated) to 0.00004066 tCO_2e/unit revenue in 2024, representing a 20.4% improvement. This result reflects a combination of methodological refinements, proactive emissions reduction activities, and a moderate increase in revenue. First, the numerator (Scope 1+2 emissions) declined from 48,338 tCO_2e in 2023 to 39,287 tCO_2e in 2024. A major driver was the reduction in soil emissions (−1,001 tCO_2e), linked to a lower area of productive vineyards, as well as a decrease in fossil fuel consumption in mobile sources (−1,144 tCO_2e). Additionally, fugitive emissions from refrigerants decreased by over 5,200 tCO_2e due to a change in accounting methodology, moving from consumption-based to purchase-based criteria, in line with the GHG Protocol. This methodological adjustment ensures greater accuracy and consistency across reporting years. Process emissions also fell substantially (−3,693 tCO_2e) as composting of pomace and stems carried out by third parties was excluded, and more precise emission factors for liquid industrial waste treatment were applied. These changes reflect both improved practices and methodological refinements, jointly categorized under "Other emissions reduction activities" and "Change in methodology." Electricity consumption increased slightly in absolute terms; however, this did not affect the metric, since all subsidiaries continue to source 100% renewable electricity through a combination of PPAs, I-RECs, and on-site generation. As a result, Scope 2 market-based emissions remained at zero, ensuring that the emissions intensity change was not influenced by energy sourcing. Finally, revenue increased by 2.1% between 2023 and 2024 (from USD 946 million to USD 966 million), contributing to further improvement in intensity by diluting emissions per unit of output. Overall, the combined effect of emissions reductions, methodological improvements, renewable energy sourcing, and revenue growth explain the 20.4% decrease in emissions intensity. The inventory covers all subsidiaries under the operational control boundary (Chile, Argentina, and the United States) and was verified by Deloitte at holding level, ensuring robustness and transparency.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

8.4

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

% of Self-generated Electricity

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Total Electric Consumption

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

10.5

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

The percentage of self-generated electricity increased from 7.6% in 2023 to 8.4% in 2024, which represents a relative increase of 10.5% compared to the previous year. In absolute terms, the company generated 6.5 GWh of renewable electricity in 2024 compared to 5.8 GWh in 2023, while total electricity consumption rose from 75.6 GWh in 2023 to 77.6 GWh in 2024. Despite the increase in total demand, the higher growth rate of self-generation ensured a net improvement in this metric. The increase was primarily driven by the commissioning of three new solar photovoltaic plants during the reporting year, which expanded the installed renewable capacity of the company beyond the 7 MW already in operation in 2023. These facilities are located in strategic vineyards and production sites, allowing for direct consumption of the electricity generated and reducing dependence on external supply. The expansion of self-generation is part of Concha y Toro's subsidiary Renewable Energy Roadmap, which sets the target of reaching 20% self-generation by 2027. To achieve this, several additional photovoltaic projects are already in advanced planning stages. The strategy seeks not only to reduce Scope 2 emissions but also to improve resilience to fluctuations in external electricity markets, ensuring long-term energy security and cost stability. It is also important to note that, even though self-generation currently represents only 8.4% of total electricity consumption, the company already sources 100% renewable electricity for all operations (through PPAs and I-RECs). Therefore, the increase in self-generation does not affect the Scope 2 market-based emissions, which remain zero, but rather enhances internal sustainability performance, operational independence, and long-term credibility in renewable sourcing.
[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, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/05/2024

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(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 2 – Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2022

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

35951.7

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

0

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

122517.5

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

22715.8

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2295.4

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

8150

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1219.5

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

738.7

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2047.5

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

59423.4

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2972.1

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

222079.900

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

258031.600

(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

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (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

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (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)

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

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

149658.328

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

31177.9

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

0

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

132729.9

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8572.7

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2430

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

6809.1

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

424

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

680.4

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2344

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

51490.3

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4011.2

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

209491.600

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

240669.500

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:
☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

16.02

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The absolute GHG reduction target currently covers 100% of Concha y Toro's operations in Chile under an operational control boundary. These operations account for 70% of group revenue and include vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, logistics between own sites, and corporate offices. The target excludes other winemaking subsidiaries—Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States)—as well as their downstream distribution footprints. Following the 2024 consolidation of the group carbon footprint (aligned scopes and categories), the company plans to expand target coverage in 2025 to include the remaining subsidiaries and adopt a Holding-level target for 2030 and 2040 (net zero). The target covers Scopes 1, 2 (location- and market-based), and 3 CO_2e across all Kyoto gases included in the corporate inventory. Scope 2 market-based remains zero through 100% renewable sourcing (PPAs, I-RECs, on-site PV), while location-based is reported for completeness. Scope 3 categories in scope of the target. The target includes the nine most material categories: Cat.1 Purchased goods & services, Cat.2 Capital goods, Cat.3 Fuel- and energy-related activities, Cat.4 Upstream transportation & distribution, Cat.5 Waste generated in operations, Cat.6 Business travel, Cat.7 Employee commuting, Cat.9 Downstream transportation & distribution, and Cat.12 End-of-life treatment of sold products. This selection reflects materiality screening and inventory evidence showing that these sources comprise the dominant share of value-chain emissions (notably packaging—particularly glass—upstream logistics and downstream logistics). Scope 3 categories 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15 are excluded from the current target based on non-relevance or immateriality to the company's business model (no upstream/downstream leased assets material to emissions, no further processing of sold products, negligible use-phase energy, no franchises, and no material JV/portfolio investments). These exclusions are reviewed annually with the consolidated inventory. In 2025 the company intends to restate target coverage at Holding level, using a previous year harmonized inventory as a baseline reference point and maintaining the same scope and category inclusions to ensure methodological consistency across subsidiaries.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Near-term (SBTi): Reduce Scopes 1, 2, and 3 by 42% by 2030 (from the corporate base year), consistent with SBTi criteria for well-below-2°C pathways for value-chain emissions and 1.5°C alignment for Scopes 1+2. Long-term (Net Zero): Achieve net zero by 2040, prioritizing absolute reductions across Scopes 1, 2, and 3 before any neutralization of residual emissions. FLAG targets (SBTi FLAG): Reduce FLAG (land-related) GHG emissions by 30.3% by 2030 and by 72.0% by 2040, integrating agricultural and land-management levers (soil N_2O management, fertilizer optimization, viticultural practices, and conservation/removals under managed lands). The targets anchor the company's decarbonization pathway, driving: - Energy transition (100% renewable electricity via PPAs/I-RECs/solar self-generation; electrification of loads and mobility). - Operational efficiency (ISO 50001 systems, process optimization). - Low-carbon packaging (glass lightweighting, design changes, material optimization). - Low-carbon logistics (modal shift, routing, rail). - Supplier engagement (SBT Supplier Program) to address upstream hotspots (esp. glass). Since the base year (2022), absolute Scope 1+2+3 emissions decreased by ~6.7% (from 258,031.6 tCO_2e to 240,669.5 tCO_2e in 2024). Further reductions were moderated by a >50% increase in glass emission factors, underscoring the need for packaging decarbonization and supplier alignment.

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

From the base year (2022) to 2024, absolute emissions decreased by ~6.7% (from 258,031.6 tCO_2e to 240,669.5 tCO_2e). This reduction reflects lower soil, process, and fugitive emissions following methodological improvements aligned with the GHG Protocol, decreased use of fossil fuels in mobile sources, and the continuation of 100% renewable electricity sourcing (Scope 2 market-based = 0). Progress would have been larger if not for a >50% increase in glass emission factors, which significantly affected Scope 3 purchased goods and services. Emission reductions are being pursued through an integrated program combining energy, logistics, packaging, supplier engagement, and viticultural practices: - Energy efficiency and optimization: Implementation of ISO 50001 systems across major sites to manage energy systematically and optimize process utilities. - Electrification and substitution: Replacement of fossil-based stationary and mobile equipment with electric alternatives, supported by expanded renewable supply. - Solar self-sufficiency: Commissioning of three new solar plants in 2024 and expansion plans toward a goal of 20% on-site generation by 2027. - Renewable electricity supply: PPAs in Chile, certified renewable supply in the US, and I-RECs in Argentina ensure Scope 2 market-based emissions remain at zero. - Low-carbon logistics: Increasing the share of rail transport, route optimization, and efficiency improvements in product transport. - Packaging innovation: Glass lightweighting programs, introduction of wrap-around designs, and reduction of input weights; collaboration with suppliers to address higher emission factors and integrate more recycled content. - Supplier engagement: The SBT 2025 Supplier Program works with 30 key suppliers—particularly packaging—to establish science-based targets and reduce upstream emissions. -Viticulture and land management (FLAG): Optimized fertilizer use, soil and cover crop practices, and conservation projects that reduce N_2O and enhance carbon removals in line with SBTi FLAG requirements. The company is on track to: expand the target to the full Holding by 2025, achieve 20% self-generation by 2027, and continue reducing packaging emissions and logistics intensity through innovation and supplier engagement.

(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

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☑ Net-zero targets

☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

78340.2

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

70.1

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

100

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.00

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

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

Yes. The 100% renewable electricity target is an enabling pillar of our science-based, absolute GHG reduction pathway. It directly supports our Scopes 1, 2 and 3 SBT (−42% by 2030) and our Net Zero 2040 objective by structurally driving Scope 2 market-based emissions to zero across all subsidiaries and geography. The target is integrated with our broader decarbonization levers—energy efficiency/ISO 50001, electrification of stationary and mobile end-uses, low-carbon logistics, and supplier decarbonization (notably packaging)—so that as electricity displaces fossil energy in operations and our value chain, the associated emissions remain null under market-based accounting. The target also underpins our FLAG pathway by ensuring that any electrification of agricultural processes (e.g., irrigation, frost control solutions, vineyard operations) is powered with renewable electricity, avoiding backsliding as we reduce land-related emissions and removals per SBTi FLAG guidance. Practically, the renewable electricity target establishes procurement and attribute-tracking guardrails (PPAs with bundled attributes, certified retail renewable supply, and unbundled EACs where needed), so Scope 2 remains neutral as we scale onsite PV, electrify equipment, and optimize processes. From a governance standpoint, the renewable electricity target is embedded in the same performance cadence and assurance framework as our emissions targets: annual inventory consolidation, market-based vs. location-based dual reporting per the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, third-party verification of the consolidated footprint,

and continuous procurement/contract reviews to maintain market-boundary compliance and certificate retirement integrity. In short, this target is not standalone; it is structurally linked to, and necessary for, achieving our absolute SBTs and maintaining progress toward Net Zero.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Concha y Toro - Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target applies organization-wide at Holding level and covers 100% of electricity consumption for all winemaking subsidiaries: Concha y Toro (Chile), Cono Sur (Chile), Trivento (Argentina), and Bonterra Organic Estates (United States). It includes purchased/acquired renewable electricity (e.g., PPAs with bundled attributes, certified renewable retail supply, and internationally recognized energy attribute certificates where applicable) and self-generated renewable electricity from onsite photovoltaic plants. The target is maintained annually and aligns with market-based Scope 2 accounting under the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, including adherence to market boundary, exclusive claim, vintage, and certificate retirement criteria. Concha y Toro first achieved 100% renewable electricity through PPAs and EACs; in 2022 the full Holding (Concha y Toro, Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra) converged on the same outcome, and the target has been achieved and maintained since 2022. While onsite solar capacity continues to increase, any residual demand not covered by PPAs or self-generation is fully matched with certified renewable attributes to preserve 100% coverage in the reporting year. All electricity used in vineyards, wineries, bottling plants, logistics bases, and offices is within scope. Both location-based and market-based figures are compiled and disclosed; the target is defined against the market-based method, which is the relevant metric for zeroing Scope 2. The target does not apply to non-electric energy carriers (e.g., thermal fuels, steam, mobile fuels) and does not include biofuels. It also excludes downstream customers' electricity and upstream suppliers' electricity. No subsidiaries or facilities are excluded from the electricity boundary; however, where onsite generation is temporarily unavailable or new sites are added, renewable coverage is maintained via certified procurement and timely attribute retirement.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

To maintain 100% renewable electricity across the Holding, ensuring Scope 2 market-based emissions remain zero and directly enabling progress toward our SBT (−42% by 2030) and Net Zero 2040. The objective is threefold: Decarbonization lock-in: Eliminate Scope 2 market-based emissions structurally, so efficiency gains and electrification of processes (replacing fossil end-uses) do not add emissions as electricity consumption grows. Resilience and credibility: Diversify renewable sourcing through a balanced portfolio—PPAs for long-term price and attribute certainty, certified retail renewable supply in markets where PPAs are not optimal, I-RECs/Green-e® certified instruments to close residual gaps, and onsite PV for operational independence—while complying with GHG Protocol Scope 2 market rules. Strategic alignment: Integrate renewable electricity with energy efficiency (ISO 50001), electrification, packaging and logistics decarbonization, and supplier engagement, so the electricity target functions as a core enabler of company-wide emissions reductions, including for FLAG measures as agricultural processes electrify.

(7.54.1.22) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

Execution of power purchase agreements (PPAs) in Chile for Concha y Toro and Cono Sur, supplying contracted volumes with bundled renewable attributes from a diverse generation mix and ensuring traceable, auditable claims within the market boundary. In the United States, Bonterra sources retail renewable electricity certified by Green-e®, covering the statutory mix plus voluntary renewable content to reach 100%. In Argentina and other jurisdictions, gaps are closed using internationally recognized EACs (e.g., I-RECs) to ensure residual loads are fully matched. Continuous rollout of photovoltaic plants at priority sites; three new plants were commissioned in the reporting period. While the renewable target is met irrespective of onsite output (through certificates/PPAs), increasing self-generation reduces exposure to market volatility, strengthens operational autonomy, and improves the robustness of our renewable portfolio. Strengthened governance for renewable claims: monthly metering reviews, annual demand-supply reconciliation, timely retirement of certificates, contractual audits, and alignment with GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (vintage, exclusivity, market boundary). Consolidated reporting includes both location-based and market-based disclosures; third-party verification is applied at Holding level as part of our GHG inventory assurance. The electricity target is embedded in our energy and climate programs: ISO 50001 systems that reduce overall consumption; electrification of stationary/mobile uses to shift loads from fossil to renewable power; and a project pipeline to further raise onsite PV's share toward the internal milestone of Concha y Toro's 20% self-generation by 2027. Maintaining 100% renewable electricity ensures these shifts do not increase Scope 2 emissions. When new facilities are added or operational profiles change, renewable coverage is preserved by adjusting PPA nominations, expanding certified retail supply, or procuring additional EACs to fill residual volumes. This operating model has enabled continuous, year-on-year maintenance of 100% renewable electricity since 2022 across all subsidiaries.

Row 2

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 2

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

12/31/2023

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:
☑ Production

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

03/12/2023

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

4513.4

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

7.96

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2027

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

20

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

8.96

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

8.31

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

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

Yes. The self-generation target is part of Concha y Toro's broader emissions reduction roadmap and directly supports the Holding's Scopes 1, 2 and 3 Science-Based Target (−42% by 2030) and Net Zero 2040 commitment. While our renewable electricity procurement strategy ensures that 100% of market-based Scope 2 emissions are neutralized, increasing the share of self-generation is essential to secure structural resilience, lower exposure to certificate/market risks, and reduce dependency on external suppliers. By reaching 20% self-generation, Concha y Toro ensures that a significant portion of its renewable electricity demand is physically produced on-site, with tangible, verifiable environmental and operational benefits. This strengthens the credibility of our Scope 2 neutrality claim and positions us to support the electrification of vineyard and winery operations with direct renewable supply. The target also reinforces progress under FLAG-related practices, as solar self-sufficiency enables low-emission energy for irrigation, winery processing, and bottling activities without relying on external fossil-intensive grids. The self-generation goal is thus embedded within the same framework of our absolute emissions target. It complements our procurement of renewable PPAs and certificates by creating real, additional renewable capacity, ensuring that the decarbonization of Scope 2 is not only an accounting outcome but also a physical transformation of our energy system.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Concha y Toro - Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target applies to the Concha y Toro subsidiary in Chile, the Holding's largest operational unit, representing ~70% of consolidated revenue and energy demand. It covers all self-generated solar electricity across vineyards, wineries, and bottling plants, expressed as a percentage of total subsidiary electricity consumption. By the end of 2024, Concha y Toro operated 24 photovoltaic plants with 5.4 MW of installed capacity: fifteen on agricultural estates, six in wineries, and two in bottling plants. This diversified network ensures renewable generation across the full production chain. During 2024 alone, expansions in Pirque, Vespucio, and Puente Alto added

1.6 MW. In 2025, a new plant at the Lontué winery and plant (currently 50% complete) will contribute 0.7 MW, consolidating Lontué as a self-sufficient energy hub. A net billing project under bidding will add 7.7 MW by 2027—the single largest increase in our history. This will accelerate progress toward the 20% self-generation target and enable advanced models integrating storage and electric mobility. The target excludes other subsidiaries (Cono Sur, Trivento, Bonterra), which are pursuing renewable electricity through PPAs, retail supply, or certificates. It also excludes non-solar sources and non-electric carriers (e.g., natural gas, diesel). Within Concha y Toro, the denominator for the 20% target includes all electricity consumed, ensuring transparency.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

The strategic objective of the self-generation target is to reach 20% of total electricity consumption covered by onsite solar PV by 2027, creating a resilient, long-term foundation for Scope 2 decarbonization. While renewable electricity procurement (PPAs, I-RECs, Green-e®) guarantees 100% market-based neutrality, the self-generation objective ensures that neutrality is underpinned by physical renewable production. The target aligns with three strategic pillars: - Decarbonization leadership: Reduce reliance on external procurement and certificates by producing renewable energy directly at our sites, reinforcing Concha y Toro's position as a sector leader in climate action. - Operational resilience: Provide stable, low-cost renewable supply at wineries, vineyards, and bottling plants, mitigating volatility in grid electricity costs and future-proofing operations against regulatory or market changes. - Innovation and integration: Prepare the ground for advanced energy models, including storage, smart grids, and electric mobility, leveraging self-generation capacity as a platform for deeper decarbonization.

(7.54.1.22) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

Concha y Toro has steadily scaled its self-generation network to 24 solar plants with 5.4 MW of capacity by 2024. Strategic deployment across vineyards (15 plants), wineries (6 plants), and bottling facilities (2 plants) ensures that generation supports all stages of the production chain. In 2024, three new plants in Pirque, Vespucio, and Puente Alto brought 1.6 MW online, marking one of the most significant annual expansions to date. These facilities were strategically selected to optimize operational coverage and reduce electricity purchased from the grid at energy-intensive sites. In 2025, the Lontué winery and plant will receive a new PV system (0.7 MW), designed to supply most of the site's needs and position Lontué as a near self-sufficient hub. Beyond 2025, a 7.7 MW net billing project—the largest in company history—will come online in 2027. This will represent a transformative leap toward the 20% goal, ensuring scalability and long-term impact. The PV rollout is integrated with ISO 50001-certified energy management, efficiency projects, and electrification of processes, ensuring that generated renewable power displaces fossil consumption effectively. Future phases include exploring energy storage solutions to manage intermittency and electric mobility pilots supported by solar infrastructure. Progress toward the 20% target is tracked annually as the ratio of PV generation (MWh) to total subsidiary consumption (MWh). Plant output is metered, consolidated, and verified. This ensures the target's credibility and allows transparent reporting in the Holding's GHG inventory, where market-based Scope 2 remains zero, but physical self-sufficiency steadily grows.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

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

Fossil fuel reduction target

☑ Other fossil fuel reduction target, please specify :Fossil fuel consumption from internal sources (GWh).

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

33.2

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

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

19.5

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

31.9

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

9.4890510949

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

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

Yes. This target is part of Concha y Toro Holding's overarching Science-Based Target (42% Scope 1+2+3 reduction by 2030) and Net Zero by 2040. Fossil fuels consumed in boilers, forklifts, frost towers, backup generators, and other internal equipment represent a direct Scope 1 emission source. By aiming for a 50% reduction from the baseline (19.5 GWh), the Holding ensures material progress toward Scope 1 decarbonization. While the market-based Scope 2 is already neutral (100% renewable electricity), reducing fossil fuel dependency in direct operations is essential to achieve absolute emission reductions rather than relying solely on renewable procurement.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based targets initiative - approved other

(7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Concha y Toro - Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target applies organization-wide and covers all fossil fuels consumed within company facilities (internal equipment): natural gas, diesel, LPG, and others used in boilers, forklifts, frost towers, calderas, and backup generators. Exclusions: Transport and distribution fuels are excluded, as they are accounted for separately in

Scope 1 (mobile sources) or Scope 3. In 2024, fossil fuel consumption in the internal equipment was 31.9 GWh, compared with the annual milestone of 27.3 GWh, achieving 84% progress toward the trajectory. Despite higher-than-expected use in operations (driven by demand), significant progress was made through electrification and efficiency projects.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

The objective is to halve fossil fuel use of internal sources in facilities by 2030, reducing Scope 1 emissions and improving resilience against carbon pricing and fuel volatility. The target also prepares operations for electrification powered by renewable electricity, closing the gap between operational practices and long-term Net Zero 2040 goals.

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

Electrification initiatives: conversion of LPG forklifts to electric models; electrification of frost towers in pilot vineyards. Efficiency measures: retrofits and optimization of boilers and chillers, leading to lower fuel intensity per unit of production. Operational optimization: improved control planning and preventive maintenance to reduce generator usage. ISO 50001 energy management system: systematized energy reviews and KPIs for fossil fuel intensity in Concha y Toro

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

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

Waste management

☑ Other waste management, please specify :Number of priority waste categories with up-cycling alternatives

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

0

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

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

10

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

8

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

80.0000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

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

Partially. While this target is not an absolute emissions reduction goal, it is linked to Scope 3 Category 5 (waste generated in operations) and Category 12 (end-of-life treatment of sold products). By eliminating landfill disposal and valorizing 100% of waste streams, the Holding reduces indirect GHG emissions, advances the circular economy, and aligns with SBT Scope 3 coverage.

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

Select all that apply

☑ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target applies organization-wide across all Holding facilities in Chile, Argentina, and the U.S. It covers all operational waste categories generated in winemaking, packaging, bottling, logistics, and offices. Upcycling categories achieved: organic waste, glass, paper/cardboard, plastics, cork, electronics, and food waste. Next categories (2025): Tetra Pak and textiles, currently under pilot partnerships. No significant exclusions: hazardous waste categories are managed under regulatory compliance but are outside the "upcycling" scope.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

The objective is to achieve 100% (10 categories) valorization of waste through upcycling, avoiding landfill and transforming waste into new products or secondary raw materials. This is part of Viña Concha y Toro's Zero Waste strategy, linked to reputational leadership, reduced disposal costs, and measurable Scope 3 avoided emissions.

(7.54.2.21) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

The actions that contributed most to this target include: Strategic partnerships with entrepreneurs: We promoted innovative collaborations that gave new life to residual materials from our operations. Examples include furniture and recycling points made from reused pallets (showcased at the EcoPlaza in our Pirque Plant), and furniture and décor crafted from reused French and American oak barrels from our wineries. Partnerships with companies for material transformation: Residual PET liners from our labeling processes were transformed into bottles and caps made of 100% recycled plastic. Glass bottles collected from bottling plants and warehouses were converted into new glasses and tableware, strengthening circularity in packaging and consumer goods. Innovation with organic byproducts: Surco: Since 2021, Surco has reused wine lees (traditionally discarded sediments) as natural cotton dyes, producing textiles such as bedding and waxed bags with unique and vibrant colors. Haproba: Using grape pomace (skins and seeds), Haproba developed 100% sustainable food ingredients with antioxidant properties, fibers, and natural preservatives. These innovations have led to glycemic regulators for diabetics and nutraceutical pellets for aquaculture, reducing antibiotic use in that sector. Sustainability Fair and active communication: We organized initiatives like the Sustainability Fair to showcase upcycling projects and raise awareness among employees, suppliers, and communities. Ongoing communication has also attracted new entrepreneurs to collaborate. Active search and integration of new categories: Beyond the seven categories already developed (organic waste, glass, cardboard, plastics, cork, electronics, and food waste), efforts continue to expand to Tetra Pak and textiles in 2025, aiming for complete coverage of all waste streams.

Row 3

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 3

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

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

Land use change

☑ Other land use change, please specify :Trees planted

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

0

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

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

30000

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

37463

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

124.8766666667

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

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

Yes. This target is directly linked to the Holding's FLAG (Forest, Land and Agriculture) SBT, which commits to reduce FLAG-related GHG emissions by 30.3% by 2030 and 72% by 2040. Protecting and restoring native forests enhances carbon sequestration, mitigates Scope 3 FLAG emissions, and supports biodiversity.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based targets initiative - approved other

(7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Concha y Toro - Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target applies to Viña Concha y Toro's Biodiversity Program, covering 4,272 hectares of native forest under protection in Chile. The specific afforestation/enrichment goal is to plant 30,000 native trees by 2025. Progress: by 2024, over 37,000 trees had already been planted, surpassing the 2025 milestone ahead of schedule. Species include quillay, espino, litre, peumo, and others adapted to local ecosystems.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

The objective is to restore ecosystem services, sequester carbon, and increase resilience against climate change impacts (erosion, water regulation, biodiversity loss). The target supports the Holding's long-term FLAG commitments, while reinforcing its license to operate and leadership in regenerative agriculture: afforestation/enrichment through the planting of 30,000 native trees by 2025.

(7.54.2.21) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

The actions that contributed most to this target include: Rauquén nursery operations: Our own nursery increased production of native species such as quillay and espino, ensuring a reliable supply of plants adapted to local soils and climates. This internal capacity supports large-scale afforestation and enrichment efforts. Annual "One employee, one tree" program: Each year, we plant at least one native tree per employee, linking corporate sustainability goals with personal engagement and building awareness across the organization. Collaborations with partner companies: We expanded our impact through partnerships with other organizations that sponsor or co-develop reforestation projects, strengthening collective action in climate mitigation and ecosystem restoration. Planting and enrichment beyond the initial goal: By 2024, more than 37,000 native trees were planted—already surpassing the 2025 target of 30,000. Planting was focused on vineyard buffer zones, degraded areas, and ecological corridors to improve soil stability, water regulation, and biodiversity connectivity. Integration with conservation commitments: The tree planting program complements the protection of 4,272 hectares of native forest under FSC certification, reinforcing Concha y Toro's role in landscape-scale conservation and climate action.
[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

08/05/2024

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2040

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Concha y Toro - Net-Zero Approval Letter.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The net-zero target applies to Concha y Toro's operations in Chile, which represent approximately 70% of the Company's consolidated revenue. This includes Scope 1, Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions across vineyards, wineries, bottling plants and related agricultural and industrial activities in Chile. The current target excludes Cono Sur, Trivento, and Bonterra, which are expected to be incorporated in 2025. The target follows the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard under the operational control approach, covers all Kyoto Protocol greenhouse gases, and is consistent with the SBTi Net-Zero Standard. Annual GHG inventories are prepared, verified by Deloitte, and recalculated as needed to ensure consistency. Exclusions are temporary and reflect the phased approach to full holding integration, not a reduction in ambition.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

The objective of the net-zero 2040 target is to align Concha y Toro's climate strategy with a 1.5°C pathway and contribute to global decarbonization efforts. The target is directly connected to the Company's Science-Based Target (42% reduction by 2030 across Scopes 1, 2 and 3) and FLAG target (30.3% reduction by 2030 and 72% by 2040). By achieving net zero, the Company will eliminate or mitigate emissions across operations and its value chain, while neutralizing unavoidable residuals. This strategy reduces long-term exposure to climate risks, strengthens resilience of vineyards and supply chains, and ensures continued access to international markets where ambitious climate action is increasingly a requirement. It also enhances the Company's reputation and competitiveness, positioning Concha y Toro as a leader in sustainable winemaking globally.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and we have already acted on this in the reporting year

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for beyond value chain mitigation

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

The Company's approach prioritizes deep decarbonization across its value chain, reserving neutralization for residual emissions that cannot be eliminated by 2040. Key milestones include: Energy transition: expansion of self-generation capacity with solar plants, PPAs with renewable utilities (Colbún S.A. in Chile, 3 Phases Renewables in the U.S.), and electrification of equipment to eliminate fossil fuel use. Agriculture and FLAG mitigation: regenerative vineyard practices, precision fertilization, and reduced soil disturbance to cut N_2O emissions; expansion of native forest conservation (4,272 ha FSC-certified) and enrichment through afforestation and reforestation (37,000+ trees planted in 2024). Supply chain engagement: SBT adoption program with suppliers, sustainable logistics (rail transport, lightweight packaging), and eco-design of glass, cardboard and cork. If residual emissions remain by 2040, these will be neutralized with certified, permanent carbon removals (e.g., afforestation, soil carbon projects, or if needed, high-quality credits). Small-scale carbon credit purchases have already been piloted for a specific brand, though internal mitigation remains the primary strategy.

(7.54.3.16) Describe the actions to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain

Beyond value chain mitigation is a core element of Concha y Toro's strategy, complementing direct reductions. Actions include: Native forest conservation: protecting 4,272 ha under FSC-certified management, ensuring long-term carbon storage and biodiversity protection. Afforestation and enrichment: planting 37,000+ native trees in 2024, surpassing the interim 2025 goal of 30,000. Supplier engagement: advancing the SBT 2025 program to help agricultural and packaging suppliers set and implement their own targets, amplifying climate impact across the value chain. Packaging innovation: industry initiatives such as the SWR lightweight glass accord, wrap-around carton design, and reduced input weights in bottles and secondary packaging. Renewable energy advocacy: investment in distributed solar plants and net-billing projects that contribute to greening the national grid in Chile. These actions reduce systemic emissions, protect ecosystems, and foster circularity, extending the company's climate leadership beyond its operational footprint.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

The net-zero target is reviewed through an annual GHG inventory cycle, verified externally by Deloitte, ensuring methodological consistency with the GHG Protocol and SBTi Net-Zero Standard. Progress is benchmarked against near-term SBTs (2030) and long-term FLAG and net-zero goals. The Sustainability Department coordinates data collection and scenario analysis, while the Board of Directors through the Ethics and Sustainability Committee oversee target progress. Recalculations are triggered by material changes such as acquisitions, divestments, methodology updates, or sector-specific guidance (e.g., SBTi FLAG). Progress is monitored through intensity and absolute reduction indicators, renewable energy shares, and supplier engagement metrics. This review process ensures transparency, alignment with international agreements (e.g., Paris Agreement, Chile's NDC), and the credibility of the company's pathway to 2040 net zero.
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*5*	
To be implemented	*2*	*15000*
Implementation commenced	*2*	*10000*
Implemented	*7*	*9300*
Not to be implemented	*0*	

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Electrification

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

100

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

12000

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

120000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Electrification of 1 Motorcycle and Frost-Protection Towers

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Other, please specify :Energy Management System

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

100

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

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

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

40000

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

60000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Implementation of ISO 50001 in Concha y Toro Subsidiary

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)

800

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

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

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

90000

(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:
☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Construction of 3 Solar Plants under ESCO Model (1.6 MW)

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity
☑ Product or service design

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

2000

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods & services
☑ Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3 category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

200000

(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

Implementation of Wrap Around (No New Machine Purchase)

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity

☑ Product or service design

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

5000

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods & services

☑ Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation & distribution

☑ Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

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

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

2000000

(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:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Lightweighting Casillero del Diablo and Diablo Bottles

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Transportation

☑ Company fleet vehicle efficiency

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

200

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

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

35000

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

5000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ >30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Implementation of SimpliRoute Software (Fleet Optimization)

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Transportation
☑ Company fleet vehicle replacement

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

100

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

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

40000

(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:
☑ >30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Rail Transport of Containers to Chilean Port Instead of Trucks
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

At Viña Concha y Toro, employee engagement is key to embedding sustainability into daily operations and advancing our emissions reduction commitments. The company combines induction talks, annual campaigns, training events, and recognition initiatives, encouraging workers to play an active role in climate strategy. New employees are introduced to sustainability during their induction process, where they receive a talk on corporate commitments such as carbon neutrality, biodiversity, and regenerative agriculture. This ensures that awareness of environmental goals is present from the very beginning of each employee's career. Engagement continues throughout the year, with Sustainability Week as a central milestone. In 2024, it extended over three days and included webinars on carbon footprint management, regenerative agricultural practices, and biodiversity conservation. Parallel to this, a sustainability fair showcased internal upcycling initiatives such as the reuse of glass, cardboard, cork, plastics, and textiles, offering employees a direct view of circular economy practices already underway in the company. Another highlight is the Green Initiative of the Year Contest, where employees present their ideas to improve environmental performance. Winning proposals are recognized by leadership and, when feasible, scaled up into company projects. This program encourages innovation and strengthens the sense of ownership over sustainability outcomes. In addition, the company circulates weekly memos with updates on environmental projects and news, maintaining awareness and continuous communication across facilities. Since 2015, Concha y Toro has also implemented a hazardous waste campaign, providing collection points for batteries, electronics, and other materials, reinforcing responsible management practices. Together, these initiatives foster a culture of participation and recognition. By combining induction talks, thematic events, ongoing communication, and innovation contests, Viña Concha y Toro ensures sustainability remains at the core of employee engagement and organizational progress.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro ensures that all operations comply with recognized sustainability standards, integrating both regulatory and voluntary frameworks into its daily management. This dual approach not only secures legal compliance but also strengthens credibility with stakeholders and aligns practices across Chile, Argentina, and the United States. In Chile, the company adheres to the Sustainability Code of Wines of Chile, a comprehensive industry benchmark that addresses vineyard management, winemaking, packaging, and social responsibility. Compliance requires continuous improvement in areas such as energy efficiency, water stewardship, waste minimization, and biodiversity protection. Concha y Toro was first certified in 2012 and achieved its latest recertification in 2023, demonstrating over a decade of consistent commitment. The company also promotes these standards across its supply chain, encouraging grape suppliers to adopt sustainable practices aligned with the Code. In Argentina, subsidiary Trivento follows the Sustainability Protocol for Argentinian Cellars, an initiative that promotes responsible resource management and environmentally sound practices adapted to local conditions. This ensures alignment with national priorities and sectoral best practices. In the

United States, Bonterra Organic Estates complies with the California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance (CSWA) standards. These guidelines are widely recognized for their rigor in addressing carbon emissions, soil health, water use, biodiversity, and renewable energy adoption, reinforcing Bonterra's position as a leader in organic and sustainable viticulture in California. Together, these certifications guarantee that 100% of Concha y Toro's own production is covered under sustainability frameworks. For third-party production, standards are applied at different levels depending on supplier engagement, with the goal of achieving broad, consistent adoption across the value chain. By harmonizing compliance with recognized certifications across regions, Viña Concha y Toro strengthens risk management, assures customers of responsible practices, and builds a resilient foundation for meeting its climate and sustainability commitments.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro allocates a specific annual budget for sustainability management, which includes significant resources dedicated to energy efficiency projects. This budget is managed at the corporate level but applied across subsidiaries, ensuring consistency while allowing flexibility for local implementation. The investment focus is not limited to electricity use but also extends to fossil fuel substitution, operational optimization, and the adoption of technologies that support a low-carbon energy transition. One of the pillars of this program is the gradual replacement of fossil fuels with alternative energy sources. Projects financed under this budget target boilers, forklifts, frost control towers, and backup generators—equipment traditionally dependent on diesel, LPG, or other fossil fuels. By testing and deploying electrification options, Concha y Toro is progressively building an energy matrix less dependent on fossil fuels. This is complemented by investments in solar self-generation, with 24 photovoltaic plants and 5.4 MW of installed capacity by 2024. The company also complies with Law No. 21,305 on Energy Efficiency in Chile, which obliges large energy consumers to implement certified energy management systems. Accordingly, Concha y Toro began the diagnosis and implementation of the ISO 50001 Energy Management System in its Chilean operations in 2023. This process is supported by the dedicated budget and represents an essential step toward structured, continuous improvement. Importantly, subsidiary Cono Sur has had a certified ISO 50001 system since 2014, providing valuable experience for replication across the holding. Monitoring and evaluation are built into the budgeted program. Investments must demonstrate a triple positive impact: environmental (reduction of emissions and energy demand), economic (cost savings), and social (worker safety and efficiency gains). Projects are reviewed by the Ethics and Sustainability Committee, where the Fossil Independence Program is regularly presented. This program aims to eliminate fossil fuels from internal processes, aligning with the corporate policy of sourcing 100% renewable electricity and progressing toward complete fossil independence. Through these targeted financial commitments, Viña Concha y Toro ensures that energy efficiency is not an isolated initiative but an integral part of the long

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro dedicates part of its sustainability budget specifically to low-carbon product research and development (R&D), recognizing that innovation is key to decarbonizing the wine industry. Since 2014, the company has operated the Center for Research and Innovation (CII), created as a response to the challenges of climate change and the growing need for applied solutions in viticulture and winemaking. The CII functions as a hub that connects researchers, suppliers, and the industry, ensuring that R&D outcomes are not only theoretical but implemented in practice. Under the 2021–2025 Strategic Plan, one of the CII's main focus areas is Water Resources and Climate Change, directly linking innovation with emissions reduction. Projects include the development of new irrigation strategies to reduce water and energy use, the evaluation of regenerative agricultural practices that lower soil emissions (FLAG), and innovations in vineyard management to enhance resilience to drought and pests. These projects have a dual benefit: increasing vineyard productivity while reducing GHG emissions, particularly those associated with energy use and fertilizer application. R&D efforts also extend into packaging innovation, one of the largest contributors to Scope 3 emissions. Concha y Toro has tested lighter glass bottles, alternative closures such as cork recycling systems, and optimized carton and Tetra Pak designs. Investments in this area are guided by eco-design principles, where emissions impact, recyclability, and cost effectiveness are all considered simultaneously. By integrating sustainability criteria into product development, the company ensures that new formats or materials contribute to the 42% emissions reduction target by 2030. Beyond packaging, the R&D budget supports experimentation in low-carbon logistics and electrification of internal transport, including pilots for renewable-powered forklifts and frost control technologies. Some of these initiatives are pursued in collaboration with suppliers, government agencies, and academic partners, leveraging external funding where possible to maximize impact. All projects financed under this budget are subject to rigorous evaluation and reporting, ensuring alignment with the Science Based Targets (SBTi) pathway. By embedding climate considerations in its R&D strategy, Viña Concha y Toro is not only prepa

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Marginal abatement cost curve

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro uses a Marginal Abatement Cost Curve (MACC) as a strategic tool to prioritize and direct investment toward emissions reduction projects. This methodology, first applied in 2012, identified 11 high-potential initiatives capable of reducing approximately 32% of the company's emissions associated with electricity and fossil fuel use. Importantly, the MACC not only quantified the reduction potential but also estimated the associated financial returns, demonstrating that many projects could deliver both environmental and economic benefits. The total projected annual savings from full implementation of these measures exceeded US$ 2 million, reinforcing the business case for decarbonization. The MACC process provides a clear ranking of initiatives by their cost-effectiveness, guiding decision-making around capital allocation. Projects with negative abatement costs—those that save money while reducing emissions—are prioritized, such as energy efficiency upgrades in winemaking cellars, bottling plants, and cold storage facilities. Other initiatives, such as the transition to low-carbon fuels for boilers or frost control towers, require higher upfront investments but contribute significantly to long-term reductions, particularly in Scope 1. Since its original development, the

MACC has been revisited and updated to reflect changes in emission factors, energy prices, and technological advances. For example, the sharp increase in the emission factor for glass packaging in recent years has shifted the cost-benefit profile of packaging-related projects, making eco-design and lightweighting initiatives more urgent. Likewise, the rapid decline in solar photovoltaic costs has strengthened the case for expanding self-generation capacity, which by 2024 reached 24 plants and 5.4 MW installed.

Row 6

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In 2015, Viña Concha y Toro implemented an internal carbon price as a central mechanism to stimulate investment in emissions reduction initiatives and integrate climate considerations into financial decision-making. This system applies across Scopes 1, 2, and 3, making it one of the most comprehensive tools in our sustainability strategy. By assigning a value to each ton of CO2e emitted, the company effectively places a tangible cost on carbon, ensuring that emissions are factored into the business units' financial planning and operational choices. The internal carbon price is structured as a funding mechanism. Each year, every business unit is required to "pay" into the system based on its prior year's verified emissions. These contributions generate a dedicated pool of resources that is then reinvested into projects aimed at reducing the company's carbon footprint. This approach not only incentivizes units to minimize emissions but also creates a continuous financial pipeline for decarbonization efforts. The system ensures that the emissions generated are directly linked to investments in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy initiatives, maintaining a balance between responsibility and action. Beyond financing, the internal carbon price acts as a behavioral driver, embedding climate awareness into decision-making processes. Managers and employees become more conscious of the emissions impact of their activities, fostering innovation in product design, packaging, and logistics. By internalizing the cost of carbon, the company creates a competitive environment that rewards low-carbon solutions, aligning operational efficiency with environmental responsibility. The initiative also enhances long-term planning, as carbon pricing provides a predictable internal signal that supports investment in clean technologies with longer payback periods, such as photovoltaic self-generation, electrification of boilers, or alternative fuel adoption for small-scale internal equipment. Furthermore, it prepares the company for potential external carbon pricing schemes, positioning Viña Concha y Toro as a leader in climate-aligned business practices within the wine industry.

Row 7

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal finance mechanisms

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro has developed internal financial mechanisms that channel resources into initiatives with the potential to reduce emissions, improve efficiency, and generate environmental and social value. These mechanisms complement the company's broader sustainability strategy, ensuring that resources are available not only for large-scale investments but also for smaller employee-driven actions that contribute to decarbonization. One important approach is the creation of funds for employee-led initiatives. These programs allow workers from different areas to submit proposals focused on improving processes, promoting sustainability, or delivering benefits to local communities. By allocating resources to these proposals, the company empowers employees to become active participants in climate action. Projects may range from workplace efficiency improvements and reductions in resource use to creative solutions that encourage circularity and environmental awareness. This bottom-up approach strengthens the innovation culture and embeds sustainability throughout the organization. In addition, since 2015 the company has operated a program to finance productivity and efficiency-enhancing projects. This mechanism identifies and supports initiatives that improve economic performance while generating measurable environmental benefits. It provides a clear pathway for managers and teams to obtain financing for actions such as energy efficiency upgrades, technological retrofits, or process optimization measures that directly reduce emissions and resource consumption. Together, these mechanisms increase the company's ability to act quickly and capture emissions reduction opportunities as they arise. By decentralizing access to resources, Viña Concha y Toro maximizes the number and diversity of initiatives implemented, from small optimizations to more strategic innovations. The participatory nature of the funding system also builds trust and reinforces a sense of shared responsibility for sustainability objectives.

Row 8

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Partnering with governments on technology development

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Viña Concha y Toro recognizes that tackling climate change and building resilience in the wine sector requires strong collaboration between the private sector, academia, and government institutions. For this reason, the company has prioritized partnerships with governments and public entities to co-develop technologies, promote applied research, and accelerate the adoption of sustainable practices across the industry. At the center of this strategy is the Center for Research and Innovation (CII), created to strengthen the competitiveness of the wine industry through knowledge transfer, technological solutions, and cross-sectoral cooperation. Several of its programs are co-financed with government agencies, enabling access to public resources while multiplying the impact of private investment. These collaborations not only increase the scope of research but also ensure alignment with national and regional sustainability priorities. Projects supported under these alliances include regenerative agricultural practices, water efficiency technologies, and climate change adaptation strategies. For example, trials in soil management and biodiversity conservation are developed with scientific institutions and public co-funding, helping to validate methods that can later be replicated in other winegrowing regions. Similarly, energy substitution and efficiency projects benefit from partnerships that allow testing of innovative technologies under real production conditions. The co-financing model has the additional benefit of fostering sector-wide transformation. By sharing knowledge generated in these projects with the wider wine community, Viña Concha y Toro extends the impact beyond its own operations, supporting suppliers and peers in adopting similar solutions. Government participation also ensures the development of standards and methodologies that can be scaled, contributing to national sustainability and climate agendas.
[Add row]

(7.67) Do you implement agriculture or forest management practices on your own land with a climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefit?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.67.1) Specify the agricultural or forest management practice(s) implemented on your own land with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits and provide a corresponding emissions figure, if known.

Row 1

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:
☑ Composting

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Around 45% of grape residues (pomace and stems) generated during winemaking are reused as stable organic matter and reincorporated into vineyard soils. These residues are first processed in composting fields through solarization and stabilization, after which they are applied back to the soils. This practice is applied across multiple Concha y Toro estates in Chile and was chosen because it represents a circular approach to waste management, avoiding disposal in landfills while returning nutrients to the soil. The program reduces environmental liabilities, strengthens resilience by maintaining soil organic matter, and supports long-term vineyard productivity.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:
☑ Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

450

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

The estimated climate benefit is calculated as avoided landfill emissions. Approximately 40% of organic waste is redirected from disposal and reused in soil enrichment. Applying an emissions factor of 10,204 kg CO_2e/ton of waste disposed (typical waste management methods), this practice achieves an estimated avoidance of 450 tCO_2e annually. The figure reflects only avoided waste management emissions; no additional credits were assigned to soil carbon sequestration or avoided fertilizer use, to ensure a conservative approach. The methodology follows waste diversion factors recognized in national inventories.

Row 2

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Biodiversity considerations

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Through its Native Forest Conservation Program, Viña Concha y Toro implements a set of actions aimed at conserving and enhancing over 4,272 hectares of sclerophyllous forest ecosystems in Chile. This area includes more than 3,300 hectares of native, mixed, and plantation forest, as well as over 900 hectares of grasslands and shrublands. Since 2019, these lands have been managed under the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®/FSC-C154029) certification, ensuring sustainable forest management and recognition of their role in carbon sequestration. The management plan includes forest enrichment with native species in degraded sectors, biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring, and the protection of forest structure to maintain resilience against climate change. Between 2020 and 2024, over 37,000 native trees were planted to restore and reinforce natural forest dynamics. These measures are directly linked to climate change mitigation, as they enhance carbon storage, and to adaptation, by improving ecosystem resilience. This practice is applicable across the company's Chilean operations and is designed for long-term permanence, with benefits expected to continue for decades. It reflects a strategic commitment to natural capital preservation, climate action under the FLAG framework, and the maintenance of ecosystem services that support both vineyard operations and broader environmental objectives.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

14900

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

In line with the guidelines established by the FLAG approach, this report incorporates biogenic CO_2 removals with land storage as an integral part of the emissions inventory. These removals are not tradable carbon credits or offsets, but physical sequestration achieved through natural assets directly managed by the company. In 2024, Concha y Toro accounted for carbon removals from 4,272 hectares of vegetation cover certified under the FSC® sustainable forest management standard, including more than 3,300 hectares of forest (plantations, native, and mixed forest) and more than 900 hectares of grasslands and shrublands. These areas comply with the FAO's international definition of forest and are georeferenced within the company's agricultural and natural landholdings. Based on the applied methodologies, the total biogenic removals for 2024 were estimated at 14,900 tCO_2. For the quantification, internationally recognized methodologies were used. For forests, parameters included annual growth rates by forest type, biomass expansion factors, root-to-shoot ratios, and carbon fractions, in accordance with Chile's National GHG Inventory 1990–2022 (INGEI, published December 2024) and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Volume 4, Chapter 4). For shrublands and grasslands, the INGEI methodology was complemented with data from the Chilean Agricultural Research Institute (INIA, 2023), applying conservative assumptions. The calculation considers the net annual carbon capture in living biomass (above- and below-ground) and expresses it in tons of CO_2 using the corresponding stoichiometric conversion. No additional correction factors were applied, as a conservative approach was prioritized. These removals meet FLAG criteria as verifiable biogenic sequestration with land storage under direct management, not associated with land-use change or market transactions. Going forward, Viña Concha y Toro plans to expand the hectares of forest under sustainable management and develop methodologies to include carbon capture in agricultural soils.

Row 3

(7.67.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.67.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Nutrient Management

(7.67.1.3) Description of management practice

Viña Concha y Toro applies a comprehensive fertilizer management strategy across its vineyards, grounded in soil and foliar analysis and plant requirement assessments. This approach ensures that nutrients are applied at the right type, dose, time, and place, reducing inefficiencies and avoiding excess nitrogen applications that would otherwise generate nitrous oxide (N_2O), a potent greenhouse gas. By adopting precision agriculture techniques, the company improves soil health, safeguards productivity, and extends the durability of vineyard soils. This practice reduces dependency on synthetic fertilizers, optimizes vineyard performance, and contributes to climate change mitigation. The strategy is consistently applied across the Chilean vineyards, forming a cornerstone of the company's long-term sustainability efforts.

(7.67.1.4) Primary climate change-related benefit

Select from:

☑ Emission reductions (mitigation)

(7.67.1.5) Estimated CO2e savings (metric tons CO2e)

500

(7.67.1.6) Please explain

The reductions reported correspond to nitrogen-based fertilizers, which are a material source of FLAG emissions. Improved nutrient management allowed Viña Concha y Toro to reduce emissions associated with fertilizers from 2,352 tCO_2e in 2019 to 1,515 tCO_2e in 2020, representing a reduction of 837 tCO_2e in one year. Calculations were based on the actual quantities of fertilizers applied and converted to emissions using IPCC 2006 Guidelines for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU, Chapter 11). Between 2023 and 2024, the emissions associated with fertilizers increased due to a change in the accounting methodology, shifting from a usage-based approach (actual consumption in the field) to a purchase-based approach. Nevertheless, when looking at the longer trend, the total emissions of the vineyards — including soil emissions and fertilizers — have been decreasing continuously between 500 and 1,000 tCO_2e per year in previous years. This practice directly supports the company's FLAG emissions reporting, addressing agricultural soil emissions and reinforcing the role of regenerative and efficient agronomic practices in achieving its 2030 and 2040 climate targets.
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We support our grape suppliers to improve the quality and yield of their grape, in soil and leaf analysis, wastewater management, as well as providing assistance for compliance with the Sustainability Code of Wines of Chile.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

The Concha y Toro´s Center for Research and Innovation seeks to contribute to the development and sustainability of the wine industry in Chile and the world. Through its extension area, the Center has a building open to the community, serving as a space for conferences, workshops and training experts, with a view to sharing the results and good practices discovered, in order that they may be adopted or applied by different agents who participate in national vitiviniculture, therein giving them a significant edge over the competition. Moreover, the company implemented a project with 18 small suppliers of the Maule region to improve their farming practices, in this project Concha y Toro is providing technical expertise and funding. Furthermore, in 2016 we assisted our main grape suppliers in achieving compliance with the Sustainability Code of Wines of Chile in order to achieve certification. Since 2019, the Company has had a Supplier Code of Conduct, with the

aim of communicating with greater detail and clarity the principles and values of required and thus reducing possible impacts on the environment, society and the business. During 2024, the company continued working on the dissemination and implementation of this guidance among its business partners.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

This activity has also a wide impact in local communities, and promotes climate change awareness within our suppliers, as well as managing their crops with the same standards that we apply in our own operations.

Row 2

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Pest, disease and weed management practices

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We support our grape suppliers to control their applications of herbicides, fungicides and pesticides to avoid vineyard resistance due the excessive applications and environmental impact that this could generate.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Part of the sustainable agricultural practices that we encourage is the continuous monitoring of pests and diseases in order to implement controls at the optimum time, avoiding excess application of herbicides, fungicides and pesticides, and resistance to some agro-chemicals. The company has a grape suppliers support area that provides technical support in vineyard management practices, visiting their farms and providing technical guidelines, with the aim of producing excellent quality grapes and meeting all standards of the company. Through these technical consults, the company oversees and supports agricultural and enological aspects such as pest and disease management, nutrient management, soil management, pruning, irrigation, among others.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

An effective pest, disease and weed management allows to increase the resilience of suppliers' crops to climate change. These activities encourage our suppliers to manage their crops with the same standards that we apply in our own operations

Row 3

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP3

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Nutrient Management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We support our grape suppliers in foliage and soils analysis to determine what elements and quantities must be replenished to the ground to permit sustainable soil use by avoiding soil depletion, and any nutritional disorder in crops.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Knowledge sharing

☑ Operational

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Concha y Toro provides its grape suppliers with technical advice throughout the year, visiting their farms and providing technical guidelines, with the aim of producing excellent quality grapes and meeting all standards of the company. Through these technical consultations, the company oversees and supports agricultural and enological aspects such as pest and disease management, nutrient management, soil management, pruning, irrigation, among others.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Emissions reductions (mitigation)

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

We aim to support suppliers to achieve optimal performance in the use of fertilizers in their vineyards in terms of quality and quantity. Efficient application helps to reestablish nutrients in soil after cropping. This is important to maintain soil's structure, and avoid the loss of CO2. These activities encourage our suppliers to manage their crops with the same standards that we apply in our own operations.

Row 4

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP4

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Water management

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We support our grape suppliers in improving their water management by monitoring their irrigation practices in order to perform their control at the optimum time.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Concha y Toro provides its grape suppliers with technical advice throughout the year, visiting their farms and providing technical guidelines, with the aim of producing excellent quality grapes and meeting all standards of the company. Through these technical consults, the company oversees and supports agricultural and enological aspects such as pest and disease management, nutrient management, soil management, pruning, irrigation, among others.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

These activities not only increase the resilience to climate change of our suppliers faced with a potential water scarcity scenario, but they also encourage our suppliers to manage their crops with the same standards that we apply in our own operations.

Row 5

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Soil conservation

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We support our grape suppliers in soil analysis to determine what elements and quantities must be replenished to the ground to permit sustainable use, avoiding soil depletion, while avoiding any nutritional disorder in crops.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

☑ Financial

☑ Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

Concha y Toro provides its grape suppliers technical advice throughout the year, visiting their farms and providing technical guidelines, with the aim of producing excellent quality grapes and meeting all standards of the company. Through these technical consults, the company oversees and supports agricultural and enological aspects such as pest and disease management, nutrient management, soil management, pruning, irrigation, among others.

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

☑ Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

An efficient soil management helps to reestablish nutrients in soil after cropping.This is important to maintain soil's structure, and avoid the loss of CO2. These activities encourage our suppliers to manage their crops with the same standards that we apply in our own operations.
[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69) Do you know if any of the management practices implemented on your own land disclosed in 7.67.1 have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.69.1) Provide details on those management practices that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation and on your management response.

Row 1

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :Operational costs

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Use of organic waste as pomace and stemp sold to third parties for recycling, results in monetary benefits for the business derived from sale of a by-product.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

The success of this type of initiative encourages the Company to find other by-products within our processes that can be commercialized, and at the same time reduce waste.

Row 2

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP2

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

An effective pest, disease and weed management approach has a wide range of impacts: - Enhanced quantity and quality of yield; - Reduced expenditure on agro-chemicals; - Improvement in soil quality, in particular in terms of its chemical and physical parameters, maintaining soil health; - Protection of biodiversity through the appropriate use of agrochemicals that takes into account the biological cycles of harmful species and helps to maintain biodiversity within our crops; - Safeguarding of water quality and cleaner water treatment processes.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.

Row 3

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP3

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity
☑ Soil
☑ Yield
☑ Other, please specify :Operational costs

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

The use of compost in our crops has several positive impacts: - Enhanced quantity and quality of yield; - Reduced expenditure on agro-chemicals; - Improvement in soil quality, in particular in terms of its chemical and physical parameters, maintaining soil health; - Protection of biodiversity through the avoidance of potentially harmful agrochemicals.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.

Row 4

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP4

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity
☑ Soil
☑ Water
☑ Yield
☑ Other, please specify :Operational costs

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

An effective water management strategy has several potential positive impacts: - Enhanced quantity and quality of yield; - Reduced operational costs associated with water consumption (through efficiency); - Responsible irrigation practices help to enhance soil quality and health; - Responsible irrigation practices help to maintain the ideal conditions to support biodiversity.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.

Row 5

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP5

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

☑ Other, please specify :Operational costs

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

An effective nutrient management approach has positive impacts that include: - Enhanced quantity and quality of yield; - Reduced expenditure on fertilizers; - Improvement in soil quality, in particular in terms of its chemical and physical parameters, maintaining soil health; - Protection of biodiversity through the appropriate use of fertilizers that takes into account the biological cycles of harmful species and helps to maintain biodiversity within our crops; - Safeguarding of water quality and cleaner water treatment processes.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.

Row 6

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP6

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Forest management plans in conservation areas have potential positive impacts, including on: - Nature forests and vegetation protect and improve soil quality; - Conservation of native forests enables the preservation and re-establishment of native plant and animal species; - Protected areas support conservation of superficial water. So far we have nearly 4300 hectares of native forests inside of our vineyards.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.

Row 7

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP7

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

☑ Other, please specify :Operational costs

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

The approach to the selection of seed variety has potential positive impacts on: - Enhanced quantity and quality of yield; - Seeds with efficient attributes may reduce operational costs for agrochemicals, water etc; - Appropriately chosen and efficient seeds do not deplete the nutritional properties of the soil; - Crops grown from suitable seeds contribute to optimal conditions for biodiversity; - Suitably chosen crops are efficient in terms of water consumption.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.

Row 8

(7.69.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

☑ MP8

(7.69.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

☑ Positive

(7.69.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

☑ Soil

☑ Water

(7.69.1.4) Description of impact

Organic farming practices have potential impacts on: - Organic crop management improves soil properties; - Organic crops do not interfere with natural cycles and biodiversity; - As they avoid agrochemicals, organic crops do not have a negative impact on water quality. - Responsible irrigation practices help to maintain the ideal conditions to support biodiversity.

(7.69.1.5) Have you implemented any response to these impacts?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.69.1.6) Description of the response

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of our approach.
[Add row]

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:
☑ MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:
☑ Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply
☑ Biodiversity
☑ Soil

☑ Water

☑ Yield

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Through our knowledge sharing activities with suppliers, we encourage them to manage their crops with the same standards that Viña Concha y Toro applies. Through the improvement of the knowledge and sustainable practices of suppliers there are a range of potential positive impacts. Practices promoted among suppliers include: - Implementation of an effective pest, disease and weed management strategy; - Development of appropriate nutrient management plans; - Consideration of practices that safeguard water resources and the health of soils. Positive impacts of these management practices may include improved quantity and quality of yield, the protection of soils and water resources, and the creation of conditions that permit biodiversity to remain healthy alongside vineyard operations. Ultimately these positive impacts benefit the local communities and are aligned with the Sustainability Strategy of the Company. In addition, through the benefits that relate to the quality of the grape produced, there are also benefits for the quality of the product that we are able to procure and commercialize. In this way these practices create a virtuous circle that benefits both our business model as well as the ecosystems and communities that share these natural resources. In terms of their climate change adaptation and mitigation impact, all of these may have some benefits in terms of the resilience of soils, water resources and biodiversity, as well as in reducing the emissions associated with the viniculture process (through the avoidance of agrochemicals and fertilizers), reducing the emissions intensity of the life cycle of our product.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Not applicable as these are beneficial impacts of these approaches.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:
☑ Group of products or services

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

Select from:
☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

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

Other
☑ Other, please specify :Low carbon wine production

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

Concha y Toro has established an ambitious Science-Based Target of reducing absolute Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions by 42% by 2030 compared to 2022, alongside a Net Zero Goal for 2040. To achieve these objectives, we are transforming our production model through renewable electricity procurement, on-site solar generation, energy efficiency programs, refrigerant management, packaging eco-design, and regenerative agricultural practices. In 2024, we advanced our carbon accounting by consolidating the GHG inventory at the Holding level, expanding the number of Scope 3 categories included in the calculation. This methodological update provides a more robust baseline for measuring progress. Using this expanded footprint, we calculate product-level emissions intensity by dividing total absolute emissions by the number of bottles sold. This approach allows for transparent year-on-year comparability of our unitary emissions. The results show a steady decline: in 2022, the carbon intensity was 1.00 kgCO_2e per bottle; in 2023, it decreased to 0.929 kgCO_2e per bottle; and in 2024, further improvements brought the figure down to 0.895 kgCO_2e per bottle. This continuous reduction demonstrates that Concha y Toro's low-carbon wine production strategy is delivering measurable results across the entire value chain, supporting both mitigation of climate change and long-term business resilience.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Science Based Targets Initiative and GHG Protocol.

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

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-gate

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

KgCO2 per bottle

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

The baseline scenario is defined as the average wine production footprint of Concha y Toro in 2022, which is also the base year for our Science-Based Target and Net Zero pathway. In that year, the unitary product footprint was calculated at 1.00 kgCO_2e per bottle, derived by dividing the absolute Holding-level emissions by the total number of bottles sold. This footprint included Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, along with initial Scope 3 categories aligned with the GHG Protocol. The baseline ref

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

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

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

0.000105

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

The calculation of avoided emissions is based on an attributional life-cycle approach that compares the unitary carbon footprint per bottle of wine between the baseline year (2022) and the most recent verified year (2024). The methodology follows the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard and Product Life Cycle Standard, applying a cradle-to-grave boundary. For both years, the unitary footprint was derived by dividing the absolute Holding-wide GHG emissions by the total bottles of wine sold. In 2022, the baseline footprint was 1.000 $kgCO_2e$/bottle, while in 2024 it decreased to 0.895 $kgCO_2e$/bottle, reflecting an avoided emissions value of 0.105 $kgCO_2e$/bottle, equivalent to a 10.5% reduction per unit of product. The 2024 footprint includes Scope 1 (direct fuel use and fugitive emissions), Scope 2 (market- and location-based electricity consumption), and expanded Scope 3 categories, which ensure cradle-to-grave coverage. Categories added or reinforced in 2024 include: Purchased goods and services (glass bottles, corks, cartons, labels, and auxiliary inputs). Upstream and downstream transportation and distribution. Waste generated in operations. End-of-life treatment of packaging materials and sold products. Key assumptions: The functional unit is defined as "one 750 ml bottle of wine delivered to consumer, cradle-to-grave." All absolute emissions data were calculated using activity data (e.g., kWh electricity, liters of fuel, tons of glass) multiplied by country-specific emission factors (Chile, Argentina, U.S.) consistent with the national inventories and international databases. No carbon offsets or credits were used; all reductions result from operational efficiency, renewable energy sourcing, packaging eco-design, and improved logistics. The 2024 footprint was verified by Deloitte, ensuring comparability and methodological consistency with the 2022 baseline.

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

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:
☑ Hydro

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Ba Thuoc 2 hydroelectric plant is an operating hydroelectric power plant in Bá Thước District, Thanh Hoa province, Vietnam. Status: Operating Commissioning year: 2012 Nameplate capacity: 80 MW Turbines: 4 x 20 MW Technology type: Run-of-river Owner: Hoang Anh Thanh Hoa Hydroelectric JSC

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

1580

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2018

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

Select from:

☑ Purchased

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

Select from:

☑ CDM (Clean Development Mechanism)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Investment analysis

☑ Barrier analysis

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

Select all that apply

☑ No requirements

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

Select all that apply

☑ Activity-shifting

☑ Other, please specify :Equipment transfer

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

Define project boundary & baseline scenario. Calculate grid emission factor (baseline emissions). Demonstrate additionality (investment & barriers). Assess leakage (activity shifting, equipment transfer, reservoir). Provide monitoring plan (electricity metering, QA/QC). Conduct & report Environmental Impact Assessment. Hold stakeholder consultations and document results. Obtain host country approval (LoA).

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

Reason for cancellation SCX CO2 Neutral Certification – SUNRISE 2023 - ID 0035-E0102A17 Number of units cancelled 1,580 CERs Equivalent to 1,580 tonne(s) of CO_2 Start serial number: VN-5-29413028-2-2-0-4823 End serial number: VN-5-29414607-2-2-0-4823 The certificate is issued in accordance with the procedure for voluntary cancellation in the CDM Registry. The reason included in this certificate is provided by the cancellor.
[Add row]

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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

All operations monitor withdrawals; surface water (58.6%), groundwater (41.1%) and municipal (0.2%). Flowmeters record daily; data consolidated monthly for internal management and reporting.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Monitoring at all facilities by source (surface, groundwater, third-party supply) to comply with local water rights; vineyard irrigation plans adjusted weekly.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Methodologies used for the measurements of: - pH, Electrical Conductivity,Cl,NO3,NH4:Potentiometry -Ca,Mg,Na,K,Fe,Mn,Zn,Cu,and othermetals:A.Atomic P,B, - SO4:Colorimetric - HCO3:Volumetry

(9.2.4) Please explain

This parameter is measured at 100% of the installations to ensure that the extracted water meets the necessary parameters for the intended purpose (for example: irrigation, bucket cleaning, truck washing, etc). The Company has an internal laboratory where samples, mainly of water for operational use and discharge of wastewater, are sent for analysis. Monitored parameters include C/BOD, TSS, Nitrogen and Phosphorus. In addition, samples are sent on a monthly basis to a certified independent laboratory. When deviations are observed in the permitted parameters, the Company must make use of filtration or stabilization equipment with which the quality of the extracted water can be improved.

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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured (flowmeters) and monitored at 100% of our facilities on a monthly basis as part of our environmental reporting process, primarily for internal purposes. The measurement is used to get a better understanding of the downstream impacts and opportunities of the Company's water usage. All discharged water undergoes physical, chemical and / or biological treatment (industrial wastewater), before it is discharged to its final destination, which is carried out by a third party.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured and monitored at 100% of our facilities monthly as part of our environmental reporting process, primarily for internal purposes. The measurement is used to get a better understanding of the downstream impacts of the Company's water usage, and identify opportunities to improve. Water is discharged to three possible destinations: fresh surface water; municipal/industrial wastewater treatment plants; and through irrigation. Water that is discharged through irrigation evaporates or percolates into the soil and the final destination of water is unknown. Flow meters are installed at each wastewater discharge point that measure volume. All discharged water undergoes physical, chemical and / or biological treatment (industrial wastewater), before it is discharged to its final destination, which is carried out by a third party.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured and monitored at 100% of our facilities on a monthly basis as part of our environmental reporting process, primarily for internal purposes. The measurement is used to get a better understanding of the downstream impacts of the company's water usage, and identify opportunities to improve. Flowmeters

are installed at each wastewater discharge point that measure volume. All discharged water undergoes physical, chemical and / or biological treatment (industrial wastewater), before it is discharged to its final destination, which is, at some facilities, carried out by a third party.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(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

Methodologies used for the measurements of: - pH, Electrical Conductivity,Cl,NO3,NH4: Potentiometry -Ca,Mg,Na,K,Fe,Mn,Zn,Cu, and other metals: A.Atomic P,B, - SO4: Colorimetric - HCO3: Volumetry

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured and monitored at 100% of our facilities monthly as part of our environmental reporting process, primarily for internal purposes. The measurement is used to get a better understanding of the downstream impacts and opportunities of the Company's water usage. All discharged water undergoes physical, chemical and / or biological treatment (industrial wastewater), before it is discharged to its final destination, which is, at some facilities, carried out by a third party. The Company has an internal laboratory where samples, mainly of water for operational use and discharge of wastewater, are sent for analysis between 2-5 times a week depending on the facility. Monitored parameters include C/BOD, TSS, Nitrogen and Phosphorus. In addition, samples are sent on a monthly basis to a certified independent laboratory.

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

(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

Methodologies used for the measurements of: - pH, Electrical Conductivity,Cl,NO3,NH4:Potentiometry -Ca,Mg,Na,K,Fe,Mn,Zn,Cu, and other metals: A.Atomic P,B, - SO4: Colorimetric - HCO3: Volumetry

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Company has an internal laboratory where samples, mainly of water for operational use and discharge of wastewater, are sent for analysis between once or twice a year depending on the facility. Monitored parameters include C/BOD, TSS, Nitrogen and Phosphorus.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Due to the nature of our activities, it is not necessary to monitor water discharge temperature at any of our installations. Water is maintained at ambient temperature at all stages of our operations. As such, we ensure that the discharge does not exceed the temperature limit established by local legislation (35C). Although the nature of the Company's operations does not present a great risk of exceeding this discharge temperature, any potential change to this is monitored to ensure legal compliance. In line with our business plans, we do not anticipate this changing in future.

Water consumption – total volume

(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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured and monitored at 100% of our facilities on a monthly basis as part of our environmental reporting process. The Company conducts an annual measurement of its water footprint following the Water Footprint Network methodology. This measures the total volume of water consumed in the production of our products, considering direct and indirect impacts in the supply chain. Direct consumption relates to water consumed during the productive process, while the indirect consumption considers water used along the production chain. We measure our water footprint in three components depending on the origin of the water consumed and the quality with which it is returned to the environment: Green Footprint, Blue Footprint and Grey Footprint. This measurement and its impact analysis help us to identify and assess future risks in our water use, identifying ways to reduce our environmental impacts, improve efficiency, and provide consistent and reliable reports.

Water recycled/reused

(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

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured and monitored at 100% of our factories on a monthly basis as part of our environmental reporting process. The Company provides full access (100%) to safe drinking water and toilet services in every facility where the tasks done by the Company workers demand it. According to Chilean legislation (Article 21 of Supreme Decree 594), for every 10 workers there must be at least one sink, one toilet and one shower, independent and separated by gender. The access that the Company provides to toilet services for its workers, goes beyond the minimum requirements set by law.

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

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flowmeter

(9.2.4) Please explain

This aspect is measured and monitored at 100% of our factories on a monthly basis as part of our environmental reporting process. The Company provides full access (100%) to safe drinking water and toilet services in every facility where the tasks done by the Company workers demand it. According to Chilean legislation (Article 21 of Supreme Decree 594), for every 10 workers there must be at least one sink, one toilet and one shower, independent and separated by gender. The access that the Company provides to toilet services for its workers, goes beyond the minimum requirements set by law.
[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)

48480.42

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Future low-rainfall projections balanced by efficiency in agricultural/irrigation processes.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

In our vision of the future, we anticipate maintaining a consistent level of total water withdrawal. Chile experiences seasonal summer rainfall scarcity, which makes one of our primary withdrawal methods less effective in that period; therefore, we pursue alternative water management models and efficiency in agricultural and irrigation processes to sustain operations. In 2024, total withdrawals were higher vs 2023, driven by vintage-specific irrigation needs and operational throughput; over the next five years we expect about the same as low-rainfall projections are balanced by efficiency.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

667.74

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Total discharges remain a relatively minor share associated with cellar and packaging facilities. In 2024, volumes are about the same vs 2023 (-1.5%); treated effluent is largely reused for irrigation and only residual flows are discharged to third-party WWTPs per permits. Given stable practices, the five-year outlook is about the same.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

47812.67

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Future low-rainfall projections balanced by efficiency in agricultural/irrigation processes.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

In the future, production is expected to grow; the impact on withdrawals (and thus consumption) depends on weather (rainfall/temperature) and production mix. Most of our water consumption is linked to vineyard irrigation, so year-to-year needs vary with climate and production; in 2024, consumption is higher vs 2023, while the five-year outlook is about the same as agricultural and irrigation efficiency offsets climate variability.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

42550.89

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

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

87.77

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

We use WRI Aqueduct (v3.0) to classify water stress and define water-stressed areas as “High” or “Extremely high” baseline water stress. In 2024, withdrawals from water-stressed areas totaled 42,550.89 ML (87.77% of total withdrawals), higher vs 2023. Coverage is 100% of facilities through geolocated sites matched to basin stress; volumes are compiled from site meters/bills in m³ and converted to ML for CDP (1 ML = 1,000 m³). Five-year outlook: About the same, as sourcing geographies are stable and efficiency in agricultural/irrigation processes offsets activity growth.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.5) What proportion of the produced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Other commodity

(9.2.5.1) The proportion of this commodity produced in areas with water stress is known

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.2.5.2) % of total agricultural commodity produced in areas with water stress

Select from:
☑ 76-99

(9.2.5.3) Please explain

We use WRI Aqueduct (v3.0) to define water-stressed areas as basins with High/Extremely High baseline water stress. In 2024 we refreshed the geolocation and basin mapping for all owned vineyards. The footprint remains predominantly in High/Extremely High basins; Bonterra vineyards fall outside water-stressed basins, while Trivento vineyards are fully within them. Consistent with prior years (e.g., 2023), we disclose a volume-weighted share in the 76–99% range. Coverage is 100% of sites; method: site geolocation matched to Aqueduct and production volumes. Five-year outlook: About the same given stable geographies; efficiency in agricultural/irrigation processes mitigates demand but does not change basin classifications. Use of metric: informs irrigation investments (ponds, reuse) and resilience planning.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Other commodity

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Supplier vineyards are mapped annually using WRI Aqueduct (v3.0); water-stressed basins are High/Extremely High. In 2024, volume-weighted purchases across suppliers in Chile and Mendoza (AR) confirm that most suppliers are in water-stressed basins; therefore we disclose 76–99%. Coverage: all contracted suppliers; method: supplier geolocation matched to Aqueduct and purchase volumes. Five-year outlook: About the same as sourcing geographies are stable; on-farm efficiency and reuse programs mitigate demand. Use of metric: guides supplier engagement and investment priorities (efficient irrigation, storage/reuse).
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

28432.71

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Main source for vineyard irrigation. Volumes metered at site level (m³) and converted to ML per CDP (1 ML = 1,000 m³).

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable within the reporting boundary; 0 ML reported.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

19948.88

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Abstractions from alluvial aquifers with active recharge; metered under valid rights and consolidated monthly; converted to ML.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable: no withdrawals from fossil/non-renewable aquifers; 0 ML reported.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not applicable within the reporting boundary; 0 ML reported.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

98.83

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Minor share used at cellars/packaging; volumes from utility bills, converted to ML; stable year to year.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

321.54

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Authorized discharges to rivers per permits; volumes metered and consolidated monthly; reported in ML.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

No discharges to brackish or seawater.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

153.43

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Per CDP destination definitions, treated process water that is applied to land for irrigation is reported under “Groundwater” (non-point source) because a portion infiltrates the soil profile. This is a reporting classification only and does not involve managed aquifer recharge or direct injection. Volumes are measured at the irrigation outlet in m³ and converted to ML (1 ML = 1,000 m³).

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

192.77

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Residual flows sent to third-party WWTPs per permits; minor share of total discharges.
[Fixed row]

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

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Tertiary treatments are not required by Chilean law to attain permitted discharge levels. Hence, this treatment level is not relevant to our Company.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

354.11

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This indicator reflects the treatment of wastewater from all our facilities in Chile, Argentina, and the USA. Concha y Toro complies with the regulations set by Chile's General Directorate of Water for discharges into freshwater bodies. In 2024, improved information availability on secondary treatment led to an increase in total water discharges treated at this level, achieving 100% treatment of all water discharges.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

313.64

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This indicator represents the treatment of wastewater from all our facilities in Chile, Argentina, and the USA. Primary treatment is applied to discharges that are sent to third parties for further treatment.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment is not permitted by Chilean law. Hence, Concha y Toro does not make these type of discharges.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This treatment level is not relevant for our Company as all discharges to third parties have a primary treatment done.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

There are no other relevant treatment levels for discharges.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

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

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply
☑ Nitrates
☑ Phosphates
☑ Pesticides

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Emissions are reported as 0 metric tons because concentrations of nitrates (as NO_3–N), phosphates (as PO_4–P) and pesticide residues in treated effluent were below laboratory method detection limits (MDL) across the reporting year. Mass loads are calculated from monitored flow × concentration; when results are

[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

76

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.3.4) Please explain

Facilities are geo-located and annually overlaid with WRI Aqueduct (Baseline Water Stress, v4.0). We classify a facility as "identified" when it is located in a basin with High (40–80%) or Extremely high (>80%) baseline water stress. In 2024, 76 of 99 direct facilities meet this mapping criterion (~78%). This screening is a location-based indicator of basin conditions and does not imply non-compliance or negative performance; it is used to prioritize water-efficiency actions and basin engagement. Coverage: 100% of direct operations.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Viña Concha y Toro has not assessed facilities in the upstream value chain at site level during this reporting year. As a proxy, sourcing is tracked by growing region to estimate the share from High/Extremely high water-stress basins (WRI Aqueduct); supplier locations vary annually, so facility counts are not compiled. We intend to extend our geospatial screening to key suppliers within the next two reporting cycles.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Limari Waterbasin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Limari

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-30.69

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.237

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3207.21

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

2393

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

814.21

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

31.69

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

31.69

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3175.52

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our 7 vineyards and 2 winemaking cellars in Limarí are in a water-stressed basin. Withdrawals and consumption decreased materially due to tighter irrigation scheduling (soil-moisture probes and telemetry), continued drip optimization and reuse of process water at wineries. Discharges are slightly higher year-on-year due to planned maintenance events at the on-site treatment system; however, absolute discharge volumes remain very low relative to withdrawals. Business exposure remains linked to irrigation needs and yield variability; efficiency projects continue to mitigate this risk.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Maipo Waterbasin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify :Maipo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.636

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-70.574

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2872.17

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1748.14

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

1039.07

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

84.95

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

196.37

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

120.6

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

75.77

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2675.8

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our 8 vineyards, 3 bottling plants and 1 winery in Maipo operate in a water-stressed basin. Withdrawals and consumption were essentially stable year-on-year. Discharges increased modestly as a larger share of treated effluent was routed to third-party systems during scheduled maintenance, with no change in treatment standards. Operational efficiency (pressure management and leak control) helped keep withdrawals flat despite production mix changes.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Costeras

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify :Costeras

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-34.802

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.685

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

846.19

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

846.19

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

846.19

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our coastal vineyards are in water-stressed basins. Withdrawals and consumption increased markedly driven by a drier growing season and a higher irrigation requirement for coastal blocks; there are no routine discharges, as water is predominantly consumed through evapotranspiration and incorporated into biomass. We continue to prioritize drip irrigation, night-time irrigation windows, and block-level scheduling to manage seasonal variability.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Rapel waterbasin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Rapel

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-34.364

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.1956

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

12208.8

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

7016.88

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

5191.93

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

24.49

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

23.73

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0.76

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12184.31

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our 16 vineyards and 4 cellars in Rapel are in a water-stressed basin. Withdrawals were broadly in line with last year, while discharges decreased significantly due to upgrades that increased on-site reuse/recovery and reduced volumes sent to third parties. Consumption rose slightly in line with field irrigation demand. These actions reduce local discharge pressure while maintaining supply security.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Mataquito waterbasin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify :Mataquito

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-35.061

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.2715

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2520.78

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

2343.66

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

177.05

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0.07

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

105.22

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

105.22

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2415.56

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our vineyard in the Mataquito basin faces water-scarcity risk. Withdrawals decreased slightly and discharges declined materially reflecting efficiency measures (irrigation scheduling and maintenance of conveyance infrastructure) and reduced need to discharge to surface/brackish waters. Consumption is essentially unchanged, consistent with crop water demand.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Mendoza Waterbasin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify :Mendoza

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-32.8

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-68.8

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

8439.99

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

2833.46

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

5590.78

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

84.36

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

21.51

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

62.85

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

8355.63

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our 12 vineyards, 4 cellars and 1 bottling plant in Mendoza operate in a water-stressed basin. Withdrawals and consumption increased materially driven by a drier season and higher groundwater pumping within renewable aquifers; discharges decreased as more process water was reused on-site and less was routed to third parties. We continue to expand telemetry, block-by-block irrigation control, and well efficiency checks to moderate seasonal peaks.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Maule waterbasin

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile

☑ Other, please specify :Maule

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-35.61

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.73

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

12456.32

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

8976.17

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

3480.15

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

56.98

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

56.98

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12399.34

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our 7 vineyards and 2 wineries in Maule are in a water-stressed basin. Withdrawals and consumption increased materially, reflecting a more water-demanding season and higher productive area under irrigation; discharges also increased, though from a low base, due to production mix and timing of cellar operations. Ongoing actions include scheduling optimization, preventive maintenance and recovery projects to stabilize future withdrawals.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Aconcagua

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Chile
☑ Other, please specify :Aconcagua

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-35.5

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-70.5

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

498.54

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

498.54

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

498.54

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Our vineyard in Aconcagua is in a water-stressed basin. Withdrawals and consumption remained broadly stable. Discharges decreased to zero after operational changes that enabled full on-site reuse/beneficial application and eliminated routine off-site discharge. This reduces local discharge pressures while keeping water needs aligned with crop demand.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not relevant to our operations. Regulatory controls focus on effluent quality; intake quality is not monitored. Total withdrawals are assured (ISAE 3000, limited).

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE 3000 (Revised), limited assurance by Deloitte. Scope: indicators disclosed in the Impact Report for the company and its subsidiaries for the reporting period (per assurance letter).
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:
☑ We do not have this data but we intend to collect it within two years

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

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

966243956

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

19930.60

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

Expected to increase next reporting cycle as irrigation and process-efficiency measures reduce withdrawals per unit while revenue remains broadly stable.
[Fixed row]

(9.8) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you produce.

Other commodity

(9.8.1) Water intensity information for this produced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.8.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

252.53

(9.8.3) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:
☑ Total water consumption

(9.8.4) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Metric tons

(9.8.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.8.6) Please explain

Water intensity is calculated as irrigation/field water consumption divided by own grape production. For 2024, the numerator reflects agricultural water use (≈99% of total water consumption) measured via site meters and operational records (47,660,772 m³). The denominator is total own grapes harvested (188,731 t), excluding third-party grapes. The resulting organizational average is 252.53 m³/t (0.253 ML/t). Scope & choices: Numerator covers vineyard irrigation and field uses; it excludes non-agricultural uses (cellar/packaging) and third-party suppliers. Denominator is metric tons of own grapes. Thresholds for trend: "About the same" = change <3%; "Higher/Lower" = 3–10%; "Much higher/Much lower" ≥10%. Inter-annual variation is mainly driven by climate (rainfall/temperature) and vintage-specific agronomic needs, with efficiency actions helping stabilize intensity. Use of the metric & forward view: The metric informs our water strategy and 2025 Sustainability targets (e.g., extend efficiency measures across production and reduce product water footprint vs. 2020). Over five years, we expect intensity to remain broadly stable as efficiency offsets climate-driven irrigation needs.
[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Other commodity

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

265.16

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Total water consumption

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.9.6) Please explain

Method & scope. Company-specific proxy for sourced grapes: we use our own-vineyard irrigation intensity (m³/t) by region and apply a conservative +5% uplift to reflect average supplier irrigation efficiency slightly below our estate benchmark; values are weighted by sourced tonnage. The numerator covers applied irrigation water (blue water) only; rainfall and non-agricultural uses are excluded. Result: 265.16 m³/t. Reason for change. Much higher due to a methodology refinement and alignment with CDP guidance to report agricultural irrigation intensity (blue water) for sourced grapes; prior disclosures used a different operational ratio scope, so figures are not directly comparable. Use & strategy. The metric informs supplier engagement and our product water-footprint program (target: −10% vs 2020). We promote drip irrigation, pressure/flow audits, telemetry-based scheduling, regulated deficit irrigation and leakage control, prioritizing high baseline water-stress areas (WRI Aqueduct). Uncertainty. Reasonable range ±10% pending broader standardized metering with key suppliers (2025–2026 pilots).
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Bottle of wine (750cc)

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.1321

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

Total number of bottles sold during the reporting year.

(9.12.5) Comment

Scope & method: Company-specific water intensity for “bottle of wine” across our direct operations. Numerator = total water consumed (C = withdrawals − discharges) in 2024: 47.8 million m³; denominator = total number of bottles sold in the reporting year: 361.9 million bottles. CDP water accounting definitions are applied; supplier irrigation and rainwater are excluded. Result: 0.1321 m³/bottle (132.1 L/bottle). Use & targets: This KPI tracks progress toward our −10% water footprint per bottle vs 2020 goal and prioritizes efficiency projects (precision irrigation & scheduling, leak control, CIP optimization, reuse).
[Add row]

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

(9.13.1) Products contain hazardous substances

Select from:
☑ No

(9.13.2) Comment

Concha y Toro's products are specifically made for human consumption and do not contain any substances classified as hazardous, adhering to rigorous food safety standards to ensure the well-being of our consumers.
[Fixed row]

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

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

We apply FAO-56 (Food and Agriculture Organization) crop evapotranspiration methodology (ETc) at the production stage (agriculture). The criterion focuses on water quantity (field water demand): a product is classified as low water impact when its main agricultural input shows lower ETc than prevailing regional crop alternatives used in comparable food & beverage supply chains. Under this criterion, wine—whose main input is grapes—is classified as low water impact in our growing regions.

(9.14.4) Please explain

Grapes present lower crop water demand (ETc) than most common crops cultivated in the central regions where we grow and buy grapes; therefore, the product category (wine) is considered low water impact during the cultivation stage. The approach is production-stage specific (cradle-to-gate) and uses FAO-56 as the international reference. No change in the method vs previous year.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

In our current strategy, we will formalize a time-bound, quantitative wastewater target by 2025. All wineries and bottling plants operate ETPs and run source-reduction projects (e.g., automated pump-overs, continuous pressing, optimized/automated CIP) that improve effluent quality and reduce organic load. From 2019–2023 we tracked annual reductions in industrial wastewater generation. The 2025 strategy refresh will set a corporate target (e.g., effluent quality/load intensity vs. baseline) with defined scope, baseline, and monitoring cadence, aligned with regulatory requirements and best practice.

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

We will formalize a corporate WASH target within two years. Sites monitor water and sanitation, and have upgraded CIP for tanks/lines/trucks to improve cleaning efficiency and hygiene. In 2025 we will conduct a WASH gap assessment and adopt a company standard (safe drinking water, adequate sanitation, hand-washing facilities, periodic audits, and hygiene training, including seasonal workers). Based on this, we will set a time-bound, quantitative target (e.g., % of sites meeting the standard / % workforce covered) with annual reviews.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

This category is not currently material to our water strategy. We prioritize targets for withdrawals, water pollution, and WASH, where we have the largest impact and control. We review our targets annually; if future assessments identify an "Other" area (e.g., water reuse/circularity or catchment stewardship) as material, we will define a time-bound, quantitative target and associated governance.
[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per product

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

103.9

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

93.5

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

132.1

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-271

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target applies to all of the operations of Viña Concha y Toro.

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

Our organization-wide target is to reduce water withdrawals per product (750-ml bottle equivalent) to 93.5 L/bottle by YE-2025. In 2024, persistent drought and heat waves increased irrigation needs; nevertheless, we contained the indicator at 132.1 L/bottle (only +1.3 L vs 2023). To return to the 2025 trajectory, we are executing a plan based on precision irrigation and operational efficiency. In vineyards, we are scaling demand-driven irrigation with ETc/Kc, soil-moisture telemetry, block zoning, pressure/flow control and active leak repair, prioritizing high-stress basins. We maintain and expand treated-effluent reuse for irrigation where permitted (e.g., constructed wetland in Ovalle, and 100% reuse at Trivento), cutting freshwater withdrawals in peak periods. In wineries and bottling, we optimize CIP and rinse cycles, expand dry-cleaning/recirculation, fine-tune nozzle and pressure set-points, and deploy smart metering and systematic leak detection. Governance is strengthened throu

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

This is an organization-wide (direct operations) target to reduce water withdrawals per product. The KPI is expressed as liters per 750-ml bottle equivalent, with the numerator being total water withdrawn/consumed in direct operations (municipal, surface and groundwater; rainwater excluded) measured from meters and utility bills and consolidated in m³, and the denominator being total bottles sold in the reporting year, converted to 750-ml equivalents. The scope covers all owned/operated vineyards, wineries and bottling plants (e.g., Chile, Argentina, U.S.); where regulation allows, treated-effluent reuse reduces freshwater withdrawals. Baseline (2020): 103.9 L/bottle; Target (YE-2025): 93.5 L/bottle; Reporting year (2024): 132.1 L/bottle. The gap in 2024 reflects lower rainfall and high temperatures that increased irrigation needs, together with the production mix of the vintage. The KPI guides capex and operational priorities—precision irrigation, reuse and loss control—with resource allocation first to high-stress basins and monthly performance reviews. Data are captured under standardized QA/QC from calibrated meters and utilities, with corporate consolidation; trend thresholds are applied consistently: <3% “about the same”; 3–10% “higher/lower”; ≥10% “much higher/much lower.” The target supports SDG 6 and our long-term water-resilience strategy by improving efficiency and expanding safe reuse in line with local regulation.
[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water management

☑ Species management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Other, please specify :Propagation of native tree species in nurseries and planting of native trees on company land.

[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?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ State and benefit indicators ☑ Pressure indicators

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
		☑ Response indicators

[Fixed row]

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

Legally protected areas

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Under Chilean Regulation, Law No. 20,283, called the Native Forest Recovery and Forest Promotion Law, regulates the promotion, protection, conservation, and use of this resource. Under this concept, Concha y Toro has identified, by 2023, 4.272 ha of native forest in their operations. Each location has a specific management plan that has been verified by FSC under the "FSC Certification Standard for Small and Large-Scale Native Forests." in 2023, 100% of the company´s operation area has been mapped to identified native forest locations.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

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

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Concha y Toro does not operates on UNESCO World Heritage sites

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

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

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Concha y Toro does not operate on UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

Ramsar sites

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

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Concha y Toro has not evaluated its operations specifically for Ramsar sites. Regardless, under Chilean regulations, the Environmental Ministry, working with the Environmental Impact Assessment Service, has developed a consolidated list of all wetlands in Chilean territory. Some of these wetlands are protected under Law Number 21.202, which specifically protects urban wetlands. Concha y Toro does not operate near or on listed wetland areas

Key Biodiversity Areas

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

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Key biodiversity areas are accounted under the legally protected areas classification.

Other areas important for biodiversity

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

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

No other types of biodiversity areas has been identified
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Chile

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Native forests within the following estates: Rucahue, Peumo, Idahue, Ucúquer, Palo Santo, Rauco, Santa Raquel, Lourdes, Villa Alegre.

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

4272.3

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

These native forest patches sit within company-owned land and are conserved under FSC®-certified management plans. No core production facilities or vineyard blocks are sited within these conservation areas. Actions during the year included biodiversity inventories across the estates (since 2010), eDNA monitoring via eBioAtlas, and nature-positive measures in nearby vineyards (nest boxes, ponds, perches) supported by an in-house nursery that has propagated ~69,800 native trees to date.

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Company activities do not occur within the native forest areas. Forests are managed under FSC® with annual third-party audits; biodiversity is monitored through periodic inventories and eDNA surveys, and conservation measures prevent encroachment.
[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

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

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ All data points in module 7

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

Climate change-related standards

☑ ISO 14064-1

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

Deloitte Auditores y Consultores Ltda. performed a limited assurance engagement over our 2024 Corporate Carbon Footprint, covering Scopes 1, 2 (market- and location-based), and the Scope 3 categories listed above, prepared in accordance with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064-1. Procedures included review of calculation files, emission factors and consistency checks. Conclusion: nothing came to their attention to indicate material misstatement (limited assurance). Period: Jan 1–Dec 31, 2024.

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

Verification_CCF_2024.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ All data points in module 9

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

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

Deloitte Auditores y Consultores Ltda. performed a limited assurance engagement (ISAE 3000) over the consistency of selected indicators disclosed in the 2024 Impact Report, which include the company's water footprint metrics (consumption, withdrawal, discharge). Conclusion: nothing came to their attention to indicate material misstatement (limited assurance). Period: Jan 1–Dec 31, 2024.

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

Verification_Impact_2024.pdf
[Add row]

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

(13.2.1) Additional information

This document presents the long-term plans and the positive impact aimed at generating for various stakeholders through the implementation of Viña Concha y Toro's Corporate Sustainability Strategy "Uncork a Better Future." The plans outlined for each program are carried out in collaboration with the company's subsidiaries and affiliates in their respective countries of operation, as well as with the various areas related to each of the different topics addressed by the strategy. The 2024 Impact Report is an account of the management and progress of the strategy, prepared according to the internal indicators that the company uses and monitors for its internal management.

(13.2.2) Attachment (optional)

Impacts_2024.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Sustainability Director

(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:

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