

Carbon Disclosure Project

CDP 2011 CDP Water Disclosure 2011 Information Request

Centrica

Module: Introduction - 2011 CDP Water Disclosure

Page: Introduction - 2011 CDP Water Disclosure

0.1

Introduction

Please give a general description and introduction to your organization.

About Centrica

Our vision is to be the leading integrated energy company in our chosen markets. We source, generate, process, store, trade, save and supply energy and provide a range of related services. We secure and supply gas and electricity for millions of homes and business and offer a range of home energy solutions and low carbon products and services.

We have strong brands and distinctive skills which we use to achieve success in our chosen markets of the UK and North America, and for the benefit of our employees, our customers and our shareholders. In the UK, we source, generate, process and trade gas and electricity through our Centrica Energy business division. We store gas through Centrica Storage and we supply products and services to customers through our retail brand British Gas. In North America, Centrica operates under the name Direct Energy, which now accounts for about a quarter of group turnover.

We believe that climate change is one of the single biggest global challenges. Energy generation and energy use are significant contributors to man-made greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, a driver of climate change. As an integrated energy company, we play a pivotal role in helping to tackle climate change by changing how energy is generated and how consumers use energy. Our corporate responsibility (CR) vision is to be the most trusted energy company leading the move to a low carbon future.

With regard to water related risks and opportunities, 99% of our water use is related to our upstream operations where it is used for cooling water in our power stations and gas assets. Using the Water Footprint Networks definition, the vast majority of water we withdraw is used rather than consumed as it is returned to the same water catchment area within the same cycle period.

For a company of our size, we consume a relatively small amount of water, although our use - especially for cooling - is significantly greater. We recognise that water availability is becoming increasingly significant to our global stakeholders and are working to increase the visibility of our water footprint. As we do not operate water-intensive activities in water-stressed areas, we do not consider water to be a material issue for Centrica. Our water use falls into three main categories:

1. Office water is potable water consumed in our buildings
2. Cooling water is water that we do not consume but redirect through pipes to cool our power generation or gas processing facilities before returning it to the same water source over a short time period; we source our cooling water from seas, rivers and estuaries (more than 98% is saline)
3. Process water is water that we use and which is then subject to on- or off-site treatment before being used again or returned to a water source

As clean water sources become increasingly scarce, we remain committed to using water efficiently and responsibly. In 2010, we reduced our UK office water use by more than 15%, exceeding our 7.5% target. We aim to reduce our UK office water use by a further 7.5% in 2011.

0.2

Reporting Year

Please state the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

Enter the period that will be disclosed.

Fri 01 Jan 2010 - Fri 31 Dec 2010

0.3

Reporting Boundary

Please indicate the category that describes the company, entities, or group for which you are reporting.

Companies in which an equity share is held

0.4

Exclusions

Are there any geographies, activities, facilities or types of water inputs/outputs within this boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

No

Further Information

Centrica adopts best practice in deciding the approach which represents our businesses structure and activities. For Centrica, best practice is considered to be the equity approach, as it ensures our environmental reporting reflects our strategic investment decisions. Therefore we report from all Reporting Entities where we have equity share.

Module: 2011-Water-Management**Page: 2011-Water-1-ManagementGovernance****1.1**

Does your company have a water policy, strategy or management plan?

Yes

1.1a

Please describe your policy, strategy or plan, including the highest level of responsibility for it within your company and its geographical reach

| Geographical reach | Description of policy, strategy or plan | Position of responsible person |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Global | At a Group level, our policy on water use is enshrined within our Group Environment Policy which includes a key commitment to the efficient use of resources such as water. The policy is underpinned by our Group Standard on Health, Safety and Environment against which each business unit is audited to confirm that adequate controls and objectives or targets are in place to ensure the efficient use of water. Owing to the spatiotemporal variability of water use impacts and the diversity of our business activities, we believe that water management plans are best implemented at an individual site level. In particular, our power stations and gas assets have all gone through the process of planning and / or licensing applications involving the completion of environmental impact assessments in liaison with the appropriate regulators and authorities and encompassing water impacts in terms of use, consumption and discharge. Within this disclosure, we employ the following definitions: Use - where we withdraw and return water to the same catchment area and within the same water cycle period (eg cooling water) Consumption - where we withdraw and use water but do not return it, or return it within a different cycle period or to a different location (such as a sewer or treatment plant) Discharge - where water is returned to a water source or sent for off-site treatment Following environmental impact assessments, individual sites will have water management plans produced as necessary and in agreement with the relevant authority. These water management plans can vary in content and format ranging from stand-alone controls such as drought contingency plans to limits and thresholds relating to the volume or rate of water withdrawal or quantity and quality of water discharge prescribed within our operating licence. In a small number of cases, our water use and consumption is not considered sufficiently material to have such a water management plan. Our water resources management at each site is reviewed regularly through our Environmental Management Systems. | Other: The Chief Executive has responsibility for the Group Environment Policy. Site water management plans are the responsibility of individual Site Managers/Plant Directors |

1.1b

Does the policy, strategy or plan specify water reduction, quality or efficiency targets or other water-related goals?

Yes

1.1c

Please describe these water-related targets or goals

| Geographical reach | Type of target/goal | Target/goal | Additional information |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| Global | Quality of discharges | Compliance with our prescribed limits on a site level basis | Where we have limits on the quality of discharge then our target is to comply with those. This varies from site to site. |
| UK | Absolute | Reduce office water use by 7.5% in 2010 | In 2010, we reduced our UK office water use by more than 15%, exceeding our 7.5% target. We |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------|--|
| | reduction | compared to 2009 | aim to reduce our UK office water use by a further 7.5% in 2011. |
|--|-----------|------------------|--|

1.2

What specific actions has your company taken to manage water resources or engage stakeholders in water-related issues?

| Geographical reach | Type of action | Action | Outcomes |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Global | Direct operations | We aim to measure all our water withdrawals through direct measurement. Where this is not possible, we employ calculations based on pump rates and operating profiles. We measure the quality and volume of water discharges primarily at our upstream assets where we've used fresh water. We do not measure open sea discharges or discharges from our offices, but are able to measure these based on withdrawal data and type of use/consumption. | Around 90% of our water withdrawals are through direct measurement. |
| Global | Direct operations | We have made changes to technologies used in offices and at selected upstream assets to reduce year-on-year consumption. In addition, our UK upstream assets undertake water efficiency audits which lead to recommendations for technology and process change. | The technologies have helped to reduce water consumption in 2010 across our global offices by 5.3% and at UK power stations by 3.7% compared to 2009. |
| Global | Direct operations | Water use in our upstream assets is strongly linked to our production and operating profiles therefore our primary aim is to reduce the intensity of withdrawals. The same dynamic exists within our offices and call centres where the dominant variable is the number of staff occupying the buildings. | We have managed to achieve a slight reduction in the intensity of our water usage at our power stations globally from 34.9m ³ per MWh in 2009 to 34.6m ³ per MWh in 2010. At our UK offices, we have reduced the intensity of our water usage from 7.78m ³ per office full time employee in 2009 to 7.0m ³ per office full time employee in 2010. |

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| Global | Direct operations | We routinely self-impose limits and checks on water costs at each site as part of the normal budgeting processes of running a plant or office. These costs are therefore regularly reviewed and if they exceed the limits then processes are in place to trigger investigation and/or change. However, currently the costs of water are considered relatively immaterial to our operations. | No investigations were triggered in 2010. |
| Facility | Direct operations | We use waste water from third parties at our Peterborough power station. This treated reclaimed water from a local sewage works is used for boiler feed water. | This has reduced our use of fresh water by 93% (using a 2007 baseline). |
| Global | Transparency | We publicly report our water footprint under the categories of office water, cooling water and process water through our corporate responsibility report, providing chartable data. | The 2010 report is available at www.centrica.com/responsibility . The section on water is at http://www.centrica.com/responsibility/index.asp?pageid=53#item_3 . |
| Facility | Collective action | At South Humber power station we have installed a fish return system, working in conjunction with the Environment Agency. This safely captures and returns fish to the Humber from our cooling water withdrawals, lowering the impact on local fish populations. At our Roosecote power station we return cooling water into Cavendish Dock which is part of an internationally important wildlife and conservation site. The management at | The use of Cavendish Dock as a reservoir for the adjacent gas-fired power station has raised the water temperature within the Dock and created an environment of unique ecological interest. The dock is currently used for feeding throughout the year by wildfowl and mute swans. There are plans to create a warm water nature reserve around the dock and its margins to provide a national nature reserve to protect and preserve the natural habitat. Cumbria County Council will be making a large investment into landscaping the area: http://www.waterfrontbpbarrow.com/waterfront_info.asp?id=WA6&catID=6 . |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | the power station continue to work with key stakeholders to implement a strategy for the management of the ecology of the dock. | |
|--|--|---|--|

Module: 2011-Water-RisksOps

Page: 2011-Water-2-indicators-op

2.1

Are you able to identify which of your operations are located in water-stressed regions?

Yes

2.1a

Please specify the method(s) you use to characterize water-stressed regions

| Method used to define water stress | Please add any comments here: |
|--|---|
| Environmental assessment Internal company knowledge WBCSD Water Tool | We have used the WBCSD Water Tool to map our locations against the mean annual relative water stress index. We have identified four offices in locations where water is deemed stressed, and nine other office/warehouse locations in areas where water is deemed 'medium' using the definitions and information provided by the WBCSD Global Water Tool. |

2.1b

Please list the water-stressed regions where you have operations and the percentage of your total operations in that area

| Country | Region within country | Proportion of operations located in this region (%) | Further comments |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| United States of America | Texas | 0 – 10 | There are three offices in the Dallas area of Texas where water is deemed 'stressed'. There are three further office locations in Texas water is deemed medium. |
| United States of America | North Carolina | 0 – 10 | There is one office in North Carolina where water is deemed 'stressed'. We have also identified offices/warehouses in Maryland, Ohio and Indiana where water is deemed medium. |

2.2

Do you use other indicators (besides water stress) to identify operations which are located in regions subject to water-related risk?

Yes

2.2a

Please list the regions at risk where you have operations, the relevant risk indicator and percentage of your total operations in that area

| Country | Region within country | Proportion of operations located in this region (%) | Indicator |
|----------------|--------------------------|---|------------|
| United Kingdom | South Humberside | 0 – 10 | Flood risk |
| United Kingdom | Lincolnshire | 0 – 10 | Flood risk |
| United Kingdom | Cumbria | 0 – 10 | Flood risk |
| United Kingdom | East Riding of Yorkshire | 0 – 10 | Flood risk |

2.3

Please specify the total percentage of your operations that are located in the regions at risk which you identified in questions 2.1 and/or 2.2

10%

2.4

Please specify the basis you use to calculate the percentages used for questions 2.1 and/or 2.2

| Basis used to determine percentage | Please add any comments here |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Number of facilities | Although we have identified a small number of assets at potential risk from flooding, none of these cases are considered a significant risk in our internal risk management processes. |

[Page: 2011-water-indicators-sc](#)

2.5

Are you able to identify which of your key water-intensive inputs (excluding water) come from regions subject to water-related risk?

No

2.5b

You may explain here why you are not able to identify which of your key water-intensive inputs come from water-stressed regions and whether you have plans to explore this issue in the future

We believe that we do not have key water-intensive inputs from water-stressed regions. However we do not currently have enough information to be certain.

We request information from key suppliers on their risks and management of environmental matters which will implicitly include water. We have worked with our Group Procurement team and an independent third party to develop a supply chain risk management process and we are now identifying tools to support this process. This will include an audit and supplier self-assessment tool which requires key suppliers to report on a range of issues, explicitly including their water risks and water management approach. The enhanced information acquired through this process should enable us to identify more accurately whether we have water-intensive inputs from water-stressed regions and to work closely with our suppliers in these cases to reduce water-related impacts where practicable.

[Page: 2011-water-3-riskassess-op](#)

3.1

Is your company exposed to water-related risks (current or future) that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operation, revenue or expenditure?

No

3.1b

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to any water-related risk in its operations

Physical risks related to water are not currently identified as a significant through our internal risk management processes. Physical water risks in the UK are also currently being assessed through our wider resilience and adaptation programmes which are examining a range of issues. The cost of water to our business is immaterial relative to other commodity costs, such as gas prices. We do not foresee any tightening of regulations in areas where we operate in terms of access to water or limits to our use of it. Of all our operations, it is in Texas where water use is most heavily regulated but we are not anticipating significant shifts in regulation there. Worldwide, our key regulatory risks are related to carbon and climate change legislation rather than water. We operate high hazard facilities where there are inherent risks which could impact on water. However, we have strong operational systems and process controls in place to manage and mitigate these risks. The consequences of an incident could include litigation and reputation risk but this is more likely to be related to wider issues than water. Therefore risks in this area specifically related to water are not currently considered to be significant.

3.2

What methodology and what geographical scale (e.g. country, region, watershed, facility) do you use to analyze water-related risk across your operations?

| Risk methodology | Geographical scale |
|------------------|--------------------|
| | |

1. Environmental impact assessment (facility level) 2. Power station adaptation at business level (National - UK) 3. Invoice validation process (facility level) - As part of our energy/water management services we monitor water consumption (including using the Group's remote monitoring system to gather real-time consumption data for the larger sites). Any exceptional usage, or upward trend above the site specific consumption targets, is noted and investigated; all water/sewerage invoices are checked against recorded consumption data/meter readings for accuracy and any billing irregularities are investigated and resolved with the supplier where applicable.

Facility

[Page: 2011-water-riskassess-sc](#)

3.3

Do you require your key suppliers to report on their water use, risks and management?

No

3.4

Is your supply chain exposed to water-related risks (current or future) that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operation, revenue or expenditure?

Don't know

3.4c

Please explain why you do not know if your supply chain is exposed to any water-related risk and if you have plans to assess this risk in the future

We have processes in place to assess key risks and to date they have shown us nothing significant that is water-related. However, we currently do not have enough data to know with certainty. Companies and organisations are not yet reporting comprehensively on water risks and issues and therefore it is difficult to assess the impact of other water-related risks on our supply chain. Through our work with our Group Procurement department and expert third parties to enhance our supply chain engagement and risk assessment (as described in section 2.5b) and through programmes such as the CDP Water Disclosure Project, we expect to be able to understand potential risks further in future.

[Page: 2011-Water-4-Impacts](#)

4.1

Please describe any detrimental impacts to business related to water your company has faced in the past five years, their financial impacts and whether they have resulted in any changes to company practices

We have not had any significant detrimental impacts related to water over the last five years. However, as reported through the Carbon Disclosure Project, we do monitor flood risk to our assets. In the UK, flooding in 2008 disrupted output at our Brigg and Killingholme power stations for a short duration. Coastal flooding is also a risk for all the nuclear stations which we jointly own with EDF and for our processing facilities at Morecambe and Easington. Our Humber and Roosecote power stations are also on the coast and we have onshore substations for our offshore wind farms. Weather-related risks such as flooding can have a significant financial impact. The actual figure would depend on which facility was affected and the condition of the market at the time the power station was switched off but this gives an indication of the level of financial risk to Centrica of such an event. The cost impact would also depend on whether other power stations in the area were affected and on what the subsequent effects on the market would be. Conversely, if it was one of our smaller power stations the impact could be minimal depending on the time of year. However, a prolonged shutdown as a result of a weather-related event would be a significant financial cost to the business. It also means that we can meet less customer demand from our own resources and must purchase on the market. If weather-related damage is widespread, energy supply may be short and prices high. For all our 'at risk' facilities, flood risk was an important consideration in the design of the stations and construction of the sea defences. It also continues to be a risk that is actively managed. For example we have used the Environment Agency's emergency planning exercise and flood maps to identify those of our assets at a higher risk of potential flooding in extreme circumstances. We currently monitor and manage the risk of severe weather events to our facilities through our meteorology teams, crisis management and business continuity arrangements, although if weather risk increases, we will look for other ways to mitigate this through changes to operational standards.

We are working closely with DECC on sector resilience plans to mitigate and manage the impact of physical risks as a result of climate change. We are also working collaboratively with the Association of Electricity Producers (AEP) to provide a sector response to our direction to report on adaptation by DEFRA. This process has involved commissioning joint studies to identify the impact of physical risks on the electricity industry and the report is due to be submitted in July 2011. We are not able to report on financial implications because of the substantial uncertainties around the likelihood and magnitude of the risks identified. There are other industries also required to report which is helping to give adaptation issues a higher profile. We have been working to identify key stakeholder interrelationships to help us understand our wider risks.

[Page: 2011-Water-5-Opportunities](#)

5.1

Do water-related issues present opportunities (current or future) that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operation, revenue or expenditure?

No

5.1b

Please explain why you do not consider water-related issues to present opportunities to your company

Water is not considered to be material to our business. The cost of water is not material enough to present significant opportunities in terms of saving. Also our water impacts are not significant enough to identify significant commercial or other opportunities. What we have done has been at a local site level, for example with our approach to biodiversity and habitat protection which has provided small-scale local engagement opportunities, although these would not be considered 'significant'. Our focus as an energy company is instead on carbon - managing the risks and taking advantage of the opportunities that carbon presents.

[Page: 2011-Water-6-tradeoffs](#)

6.1

Has your company identified any linkages or trade-offs between water and carbon emissions in its operations or supply chain?

Yes

6.1a

Please describe the linkages or trade-offs and the related management policy or action

| Linkage or trade-off | Policy or action |
|--|--|
| We have identified linkages on a small scale (57kW). For example, we are planning to install a mini hydro-electric plant at Tredegar Academy, Wales later this year as part of our carbon reduction plans. On an ongoing basis, we run energy optimisation programmes at our power plants that can lead to the installation of more efficient pumping systems, reducing water consumed as well as energy load. However, in terms of large-scale material linkages, our focus is on carbon risks and opportunities and we do not relate them directly to water. | Part of our Internal carbon footprint target which demonstrates our commitment to our vision of providing energy for a low carbon world. |

[Module: 2011-Water-Account](#)

[Page: 2011-Water-7-Withdrawals](#)

7.1

Are you able to provide data, whether measured or estimated, on water withdrawals within your operations?

Yes

7.1a

Please report the water withdrawals within your operations for the reporting year

| Country or geographical reach | Withdrawal type | Quantity (ML/yr) | Proportion of data that has been verified (%) | Comments |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---|--|
| United Kingdom | Surface | 5224 | 0 – 25 | Excludes all saline single pass cooling water |
| United Kingdom | Groundwater | 0 | 0 – 25 | |
| United Kingdom | Wastewater | 582 | 0 – 25 | |
| United Kingdom | Municipal water | 781 | 0 – 25 | |
| United Kingdom | Other: Seawater | 824646 | 0 – 25 | All single pass saline cooling water (subtotal for UK withdrawals is 831,233ML/yr) |
| Other: North America | Surface | 4118 | 0 – 25 | |
| Other: North America | Groundwater | 43 | 0 – 25 | |
| Other: North America | Wastewater | 0 | 0 – 25 | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|------|--------|--|
| Other: North America | Municipal water | 1023 | 0 – 25 | (Subtotal for North American withdrawals is 5575ML/yr) |
|----------------------|-----------------|------|--------|--|

7.2

Are you able to provide data, whether measured or estimated, on water recycling/reuse within your operations?

No

7.2b

Please explain why you are not able to provide data for water recycling/reuse within your operations

We do not capture data on water recycled and reused in our operations as the volumes involved are immaterial at present. At some of our power stations cooling and boiler water is recirculated within closed loop systems with only top up water added when needed. We also use waste from other companies in some instances, reclaiming sewer water, but this is inconsistent with the definition provided here for recycling.

7.3

Please use this space to describe the methodologies used for questions 7.1 and 7.2 or to report withdrawals or recycling/reuse in a different format to that set out above

Although we agree that the GRI indicator EN8 can contribute to an understanding of the scale of potential impacts and risks associated with reporting organisations water use, we do not support the scope of the category 'surface water' as including both fresh (river and lake) and sea water. The nature and severity of scarcity and vulnerability often differ greatly between the two source-types and as such we strongly advocate that they be separately reported to allow for meaningful interpretation.

To illustrate the above point, approximately 98.5% of Centrica's water withdrawal constitutes saline water abstracted from estuaries, docks or open ocean, resulting in significantly lower impacts and risks than that associated with freshwater.

We are encouraged that the CDP in its 2011 guidance now directs organisations to report sea water separately from freshwater withdrawals. We continue to categorise saline waters from estuarine or dock environments with open sea water as water sources with similar sensitivities.

Additionally, we strongly urge those wishing to interpret water data to recognise the importance of exactly how water is used once withdrawn. Over 99% of the water Centrica withdraws is used for cooling at our upstream power and gas assets. 99% of this water is returned to the same catchment area within a short space of time and is therefore not consumed, but used. To be clear of this distinction is key to the interpretation of our data and is fundamental to the understanding of our risks and impacts related to water.

We are encouraged that the CDP in its 2011 guidance now directs organisations to report cooling water separately from other withdrawals. We continue to make a distinction between quickly returned 'single-pass' cooling water considered 'used' and water used for 'closed-loop' cooling which is not returned in the same cycle and therefore considered 'consumed'.

7.4

Are any water sources significantly affected by your company's withdrawal of water?

No

7.4b

You may explain here why your company's withdrawal of water does not significantly affect any water sources

Over 99% of the water Centrica withdraws is used for cooling at our upstream power and gas assets. 99% of this water is returned to the same catchment area within a short space of time and is therefore not consumed, but used. It should also be noted that the figures provided for surface water include saline cooling water.

[Page: 2011-Water-8-Discharges](#)

8.1

Are you able to identify discharges of water from your operations by destination, by treatment method and by quality using standard effluent parameters?

Yes

8.2

Did your company pay any penalties or fines for significant breaches of discharge agreements or regulations in the reporting period?

Yes

8.2a

Please describe the quality, quantity and destination of the water that was the subject of the significant breach(es), the associated fines and any actions taken to minimise the risk of future non-compliance

| Country or geographical reach | Quantity (ML) | Quality | Fines and penalties | Company action and outcomes |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| Norway | 0.1 | Quantity is 0.025ML; Localised impact on receiving environment | On 21 May 2010, approximately 25m ³ of cement was released from the drilling rig West Alpha in the Norwegian Sea. The cement was released due to operational difficulties related to lumps in the cement. We informed regulators and our investigations concluded that the impact on the local environment was not significant. | As a consequence of our internal investigation, we are reviewing our risk management and non-compliance processes and those of our contractors, as well as enhancing the understanding of relevant regulations for Centrica and drilling/contractor staff. The spill is under investigation by the authorities but corrective actions already in place include procedural modifications and improved training schemes. Local sampling and monitoring indicated no environmental impact. Cement is classified as a PLONOR chemical, meaning that under the OSPAR convention it is designated as presenting little or no risk to the environment. |
| Netherlands | 0 | Quantity is 0.0057ML; Localised impact on receiving environment | 23 November 2010 - There was one chemical spill from the drilling rig over F3-FA-1 in the Netherlands where 11t of drilling mud was released into the marine environment. The Dutch regulator imposed a fine following the incident. | A full investigation was conducted and an impact assessment which determined the impact on the environment to be negligible. Corrective actions included a full review of our permit to work system and risk assessment procedures. Chemical management for drilling operations remains a focus for 2011 with a specific emphasis on replacing the more hazardous chemicals with more benign equivalents. |
| Netherlands | 0 | Quantity is 0.00275ML; Localised impact on receiving environment | 25 October 2010 Approx 2750 litres of coolant was discharged to the sea when a cooling pump was being replaced on an offshore rig. The Dutch regulator imposed a fine following the incident. | A full investigation was conducted and an impact assessment which determined the impact on the environment to be negligible. Corrective actions included permit to work and risk assessment improvements. |

8.3

Are any water bodies and related habitats significantly affected by discharges of water or runoff from your operations?

Yes

8.3a

Please list any water bodies and related habitats which are significantly affected by discharge of water or runoff from your operations

| Country | Water body | Impact | Company action and outcomes |
|----------------|----------------|--|---|
| United Kingdom | Cavendish Dock | At our Roosecote power station we return cooling water into Cavendish Dock which is part of an internationally important wildlife and conservation site. This has raised the water temperature within the Dock and created an environment of unique ecological interest. | The management at the power station continue to work with key stakeholders to implement a strategy for the management of the ecology of the dock. There are plans to create a warm water nature reserve around the dock and its margins to provide a national nature reserve to protect and preserve the natural habitat. Cumbria County Council will be making a large investment into landscaping the area. |

Page: 2011-Water-9-Intensity

9.1

Please provide any available financial intensity values for your company's water use across its operations

| Country or geographical region | Financial metric | Water use type | Financial intensity (US\$/ML) | Please provide any contextual details that you consider relevant to understand the units or figures you have provided. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| United Kingdom | Other: Adjusted operating profit | Withdrawals | 4223 | |
| Other: North America | Other: Adjusted operating profit | Withdrawals | 67940 | |

9.2

Please provide any available water intensity values for your company's products across its operations

| Country or geographical reach | Product | Product unit | Water use type | Water unit | Water intensity (Water unit/product unit) | Please provide any contextual details that you consider relevant to understand the units or figures you have provided. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|------------|---|--|
| United Kingdom | Electricity | Other: MWh | Withdrawals | Other: m3 | 27.4 | UK power stations withdraw from saline and freshwater sources |
| Other: North America | Electricity | Other: MWh | Withdrawals | Other: m3 | 0.7 | North America withdraws from freshwater sources only |

Carbon Disclosure Project