Steelcase - Climate Change 2022

C0. Introduction

C0.1

(C0.1) Give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Organizations around the world trust Steelcase to help them create workplaces that help people work better, be inspired and accomplish more. The company designs, manufactures and partners with other leading organizations to provide architecture, furniture and technology solutions – accessible through a network of channels, including over 800 Steelcase dealer locations. Steelcase is a global, industry-leading and publicly traded company with fiscal 2022 revenue of $2.8 billion.

C0.2

(C0.2) State the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Reporting year	March 1 2021	February 28 2022	No	<Not Applicable>

C0.3

(C0.3) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

China
Czechia
France
Germany
India
Malaysia
Mexico
Spain
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America

C0.4

(C0.4) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

USD

C0.5

(C0.5) Select the option that describes the reporting boundary for which climate-related impacts on your business are being reported. Note that this option should align with your chosen approach for consolidating your GHG inventory.

Financial control

C0.8

(C0.8) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

Indicate whether you are able to provide a unique identifier for your organization	Provide your unique identifier
Yes, an ISIN code	8581552036

C1. Governance

C1.1

(C1.1) Is there board-level oversight of climate-related issues within your organization?

Yes

C1.1a

(C1.1a) Identify the position(s) (do not include any names) of the individual(s) on the board with responsibility for climate-related issues.

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	The President and Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Steelcase (the "Company") climate change strategy, coordinating multi-functional efforts, and allocating capital. The CEO oversees the Carbon Oversight Committee made up of senior leadership and they meet biannually. The Carbon Oversight Committee oversees the work of the carbon core team which meets on a quarterly basis. The Carbon Core Team is focused on the implementation of our carbon strategy across all targets and business units and coordinates the broader engagement of the organization and the supply chain.
Board-level committee	The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee ("NCGC") of the Steelcase Inc. Board of Directors (the "Board") oversees Steelcase's strategy and policies with respect to environmental, social, and governance ("ESG") matters. This committee is also responsible for our sustainability strategy, ensuring its progress toward the agreed upon targets, including climate, risk, and governance issues.

C1.1b

(C1.1b) Provide further details on the board's oversight of climate-related issues.

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Scope of board-level oversight	Please explain
Scheduled – some meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Reviewing and guiding business plans Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues	<Not Applicable>	The CEO is responsible for overseeing the implementation of Steelcase climate change strategy, coordinating multi-functional efforts, and allocating capital. The NCGC has ultimate oversight of our ESG strategy, and this responsibility is included in the committee charter. The NCGC meets quarterly during the reporting year. The NCGC periodically reviews the Company's performance against its ESG goals which includes the related 2030 science-based carbon reduction targets During each of the quarterly NCGC meetings, ESG was a part of the agenda and updates were provided. ESG updates are provided to the NCGC during these quarterly meetings. The NCGC reviewed and agreed on a guiding strategy, plans of action, as well as responsibilities and oversight structure. Additional meetings will establish structures for overseeing capital allocation, monitoring progress towards targets, and more specific action plans. In addition to the board level oversight of climate-related issues, we have a Carbon Oversight Committee comprised of top internal leadership, including the CEO. This Carbon Oversight Committee meets twice per year and reviews the work of the Carbon Core Team. The Carbon Core Team meets on a quarterly basis and is responsible for strategy and implementation of our carbon reduction goals.

C1.1d

(C1.1d) Does your organization have at least one board member with competence on climate-related issues?

	Board member(s) have competence on climate-related issues	Criteria used to assess competence of board member(s) on climate-related issues	Primary reason for no board-level competence on climate-related issues	Explain why your organization does not have at least one board member with competence on climate-related issues and any plans to address board-level competence in the future
Row 1	Yes	Steelcase has multiple board members with competence on climate-related issues. One member of the Board provides insightful additions to ESG discussions on the NCGC due to their technical background and experience, and their personal interest in environmental issues. This individual has been a board member at Steelcase for 34 years and is a third-generation descendant from an original founder of the company. They earned a doctorate in organic chemistry from the University of California, Berkeley. Prior to joining Steelcase, they acted as manager of chemical manufacturing at large pharmaceutical company. In addition to their professional responsibilities, they are a member of the Wege Foundation in Grand Rapids, Michigan which is known for its focus on environmental and community philanthropy. The Wege Foundation funds the annual internship with the Steelcase Sustainability Team through the University of Michigan School for Environment and Sustainability. Another board member who is knowledgeable about climate-related issues is a member of the NCGC and was recently named chair of the committee. This director is Co-CEO of IDEO which launched a clearinghouse about climate change and environmental design thinking, LivingClimateChange.com. This director has also given a TED talk which discusses environmental challenges. This director is stepping into the chair position of the NCGC and will have jurisdiction over ESG decisions. In addition to having current members with competence in climate-related issues, the NCGC has responsibility for recommending qualified individuals to serve as directors of the Company and on committees of the Board, advising the Board with respect to board composition, and overseeing the evaluation of the Board and the Company's management. As a result, the NCGC has the opportunity and responsibility to maintain ESG (including climate-related) competence among its committee members and the Board as a whole.	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C1.2

(C1.2) Provide the highest management-level position(s) or committee(s) with responsibility for climate-related issues.

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Reporting line	Responsibility	Coverage of responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Quarterly
Other committee, please specify (Carbon Oversight Committee)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Half-yearly
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify (SVP, Chief Administrative Officer, General Counsel and Secretary ("General Counsel"))	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Quarterly

C1.2a

(C1.2a) Describe where in the organizational structure this/these position(s) and/or committees lie, what their associated responsibilities are, and how climate-related issues are monitored (do not include the names of individuals).

The CEO is ultimately responsible for overseeing and monitoring progress against the strategy as well as making decisions regarding strategic investments and financing mechanisms pertaining to sustainability goals. The Carbon Strategy and Sustainability Customer Engagement Manager is responsible for creating the company's climate change strategy. Approval of the strategy and associated initiatives are directly sought from the CEO. This Manager reports directly to the Sustainability Director, who ultimately reports to the General Counsel. The Carbon Oversight Committee, comprised of senior executive officers across business units, is responsible for assessing, prioritizing, and approving emission reduction projects. The General Counsel is responsible for managing ESG strategy and performance, and the SVP, Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") oversees the financial planning and budget for allocating capital to favorable carbon reduction projects. The Vice President of Global Operations is responsible for implementing projects and initiatives to reduce emissions from our operations and facilities and for overseeing emissions reduction initiatives relating to our value chain emissions and supply chain engagement. Once again, the NCGC has ultimate oversight over Steelcase's ESG strategies and policies, which includes climate-related risks and opportunities. The NCGC also reviews the company's performance against ESG goals.

C1.3

(C1.3) Do you provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues, including the attainment of targets?

	Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues	Comment
Row 1	Yes	Our General Counsel has a percentage of their annual bonus tied to her performance against ESG goals which includes our climate-related science-based targets. The General Counsel leads the Sustainability and ESG teams. The annual bonus can be throttled up or down by 0.1-10%. The primary climate-related activities that are incentivized are supply chain engagement, efficiency targets, and emissions reduction targets.

C1.3a

(C1.3a) Provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate-related issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Other C-Suite Officer	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction target Company performance against a climate-related sustainability index	A percentage of the General Counsel's annual bonus is tied to the company's performance against ESG goals. Our General Counsel leads the Sustainability and ESG teams.
Other, please specify (Operations employees)	Monetary reward	Energy reduction project	Operations employees have an incentive program that rewards employees for identifying process improvements which reduce energy consumption and waste, improve operational efficiency, and contribute to increased productivity, through their suggestions.

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

(C2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities?

Yes

C2.1a

(C2.1a) How does your organization define short-, medium- and long-term time horizons?

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	1	Our time horizons are based on the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure ("TCFD") recommended time horizons and adapted to account for our organization's assets, risks, partnerships, sectors, and geographies. This figure is not an explicit company policy or codified internally. While we do have a three-year financial plan with the Board, we manage the business on a one-year plan. With respect to strategy, we refresh the strategy every three years, or periodically based on circumstances. A strategy refresh could take place within a three-year cycle due to unforeseen circumstances as we did recently due to the pandemic's impact.
Medium-term	1	3	Our time horizons are based on the TCFD recommended time horizons and adapted to account for our organization's assets, risks, partnerships, sectors, and geographies. This figure is not an explicit company policy or codified internally. While we do have a three-year financial plan with the Board, we manage the business on a one-year plan. With respect to strategy, we refresh the strategy every three years, or periodically based on circumstances. A strategy refresh could take place within a three-year cycle due to unforeseen circumstances as we did recently due to the pandemic's impact.
Long-term	3	10	Our time horizons are based on the TCFD recommended time horizons and adapted to account for our organization's assets, risks, partnerships, sectors, and geographies. This figure is not an explicit company policy or codified internally.

C2.1b

(C2.1b) How does your organization define substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

We consider risks on a case-by-case basis and use several indicators as guidelines to define substantive financial or strategic impact on our business. Any risk that could have a 10% impact on regional operations income is considered to have substantive financial impact. There are certain cases in which a risk less than 10% impact would be considered. We closely monitor substantive financial and strategic impact on our business as they relate to regulatory changes, our people, our property, and the market. From an insurance perspective, we try to insure anything that could have a substantial or strategic impact. Other quantifiable financial indicators including direct and indirect costs, revenue, etc. are used to identify substantive financial impact, and strategic indicators from materiality assessments and scenario analysis are used to further define substantive strategic impact. There are no hard definitions of these risks, but each one is continually assessed based on materiality from a financial standpoint. In addition to materiality, we also consider our own physical and transition climate risks, and those of our suppliers one and two tiers removed, and how best to mitigate those risks. The Enterprise Risk Management ("ERM") team assesses corporate risks and financial exposure and makes recommendations to reduce those risks, including risks arising from climate change.

C2.2

(C2.2) Describe your process(es) for identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities.

Value chain stage(s) covered
Direct operations
Upstream
Downstream

Risk management process
Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment
More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered
Short-term
Medium-term
Long-term

Description of process
As a global company with presence in regions that are subject to physical risks of climate change, we recognize and plan for risks of shifting climate patterns, both acute and chronic. We have a structured, integrated approach to identify, assess and manage climate-related risks. The Sustainability Team assesses climate-related risks on each time horizon and provides updates to senior leadership. The Sustainability Team and Product Marketing closely monitor trends and transitions in the market to assess potential climate risk and opportunities that could impact revenue due to shifting customer preferences. The Sustainability Team also conducts materiality assessments to qualify and prioritize these risks and opportunities. In addition, potential climate policies and regulations changes are closely monitored in each region where we operate, and the Sustainability Team assesses each depending on their potential impact; for example, risks to our operating costs on each of the time horizons. Through this process, we can quantify the potential increase in operating cost for our direct operations should there be a carbon tax in regions where we operate. These processes also allow us to identify transitional risks and opportunities related to climate change; for example, customer expectations, corporate reputation, and the potential increase in upstream material costs (e.g., steel, etc.). Planning for future risk by implementing resiliency strategies for these hazards in the various regions reduces Steelcase's overall susceptibility to risk. Our resiliency strategy includes implementing circular economy practices, reducing reliance on international supply chains, and investing in technological developments. We have an ERM process in place to identify, prioritize, and manage risks. The ERM Team assess significant corporate risk on a quarterly basis. The ERM Committee is comprised of the CEO, CFO, CIO, General Counsel, Treasurer, Corporate Compliance Officer, Senior Risk Officer, Corporate Controller, Head of Global Audit, and Risk Manager. Each quarter, the ERM Team interviews the CEO and the functional leaders in each of our three regions (EMEA, NA, and APAC) to identify current and emerging risks, and to understand the actions necessary to mitigate these risks. All business risks are mapped on a matrix based on likelihood and severity and are updated regularly. The ERM Committee meets quarterly to review the risk mitigation plan and metrics, and to identify emerging risks not already covered in the monthly finance or competitive reviews. The ERM Team leader also updates the Board's Audit Committee on risk issues quarterly. Each year, we have a list of strategic priorities that are identified as top risks of the company, integrated into the corresponding functional areas and managed by the executive team and the Board. ESG directly supports two of our four FY22 strategy choices and relatedly, climate-related risks were managed under this strategic priority framework. In recent years, we have experienced operational impacts of natural disasters and they have threatened our operations. These have caused and threatened major disruptions to our operations, our property, and our employees. Steelcase has a long-standing legacy of protecting the health and safety of our employees, and therefore these events have prompted us to further invest in infrastructure and practices that better protect our employees and our facilities. We have made improvements in fire protection systems and tornado shelters, and we continue to prioritize training and practices such as tornado drills. When relevant, severe weather risk is integrated into business continuity plans, and those are reviewed at least quarterly by both the functional team (e.g., operations and corporate security) and the ERM Committee. These risks are reviewed through monthly finance reviews, quarterly competitive reviews, risk reviews and the quarterly Audit Committee meetings. Many of these risks are subject to periodic audit by the Corporate Audit Team. Transition risks such as emerging climate policy and shifting market preferences are integrated into the sustainability and ESG functional areas, and are ultimately managed by the General Counsel as the risk owner for ESG. At Steelcase, the Sustainability Team has been closely monitoring emerging climate policy trends in each of the three regions where we operate and assessing the potential financial impact should there be a carbon tax. The trend to price carbon is growing globally to curb emissions and expedite the transition to a low carbon economy. The Sustainability Team tracks other shifting market trends like customer preferences and investor ratings. These risks are managed by the Sustainability and the ESG Teams with updates provided to the General Counsel and reviewed quarterly by the relevant board committees.

C2.2a

(C2.2a) Which risk types are considered in your organization's climate-related risk assessments?

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	Climate change poses a risk to our company, and we are committed to complying with regulatory requirements. We ensure compliance with regulations in every region where we operate. Examples of risks from current regulation include reputational risk and the cost of non-compliance. These have always been included in our assessments and we continue to monitor and adapt accordingly. Some of our regulatory compliance activities include disclosing relevant data to the regulatory agencies on our air and greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, conducting quarterly sustainability audits at our facilities, increasing recycled content in plastics, and reducing waste in packaging. Steelcase always considers current regulation risk in our climate risk assessment. Failure to meet regulatory requirements could expose Steelcase to penalties, litigation, and brand damage.
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	Emerging regulations can affect our costs and business planning. We closely monitor legislative trends and potential emerging regulations and prepare and adapt our processes in advance of potential future taxes or regulations which could impact our business. Some of the policy and regulatory topics and trends that could impact Steelcase are right to repair laws, new requirements for climate and carbon disclosure, carbon taxation/pricing, building efficiency, and energy pricing. Steelcase textile, urethane foam, iron, steel, and glass suppliers are at greater risk from a transitional risk standpoint. We are helping these suppliers plan for future transitional risk, which in turn reduces risk for Steelcase.
Technology	Relevant, always included	Technology, renewable energy, and changing energy markets are included in our risk assessments. We study the changing landscape when we consider opportunities for additional renewable energy investments, contract for physical energy, explore new markets, and engage with policymakers. We strive to make energy affordable, reliable and renewable, and technology is paramount to those goals.
Legal	Relevant, always included	We take our legal obligations seriously. The European Union and Asia-Pacific countries have adopted regulations to restrict the use of certain chemicals (e.g. REACH), limit packaging (e.g. the packaging directive), encourage end-of-life services, limit the use of hazardous materials and reduce waste.
Market	Relevant, always included	There are many elements of the market that Steelcase considers in our climate-related risk assessment. In terms of renewable energy markets, we study the changing landscape when we consider opportunities for additional renewable energy investments, contract for physical energy, explore new markets, and engage with policymakers. Through our advocacy efforts and work engaging policymakers, we respond to changing markets and influence markets. In terms of the office furniture market, we consider the risks of shifting market demand in product offerings and customer expectations. Examples include reduced market demand for higher carbon products, growing expectations for responsible conduct from stakeholders, increased operating costs for high carbon activities, and energy regulation and policies at the international, national, and state level. To address these shifts in the market, we have launched new products like Steelcase Flex Perch which is the first furniture product to reduce the use of fossil resources through CCycling. This innovation in sustainability transforms post-consumer waste from electronics production (once impossible), to recycle into like-new raw material needed for the production of high-quality products – reducing waste and reliance on fossil resources associated with carbon emissions. Steelcase Flex Perch is 100% recyclable, made for circularity, and ultimately contributes to a system that recycles more effectively and productively for future applications.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	Damages or the risk of damages to our reputation could lead to loss of customers, potential customers, unfavorable treatment by regulators, investors, and insurance companies, loss of interest from potential and/or employees, and other unwanted consequences. These also present risks of losing our competitive edge and reputational brand image from failure to plan for climate risk. This could lead to breaches of trust with customers, partners, investors, shareholders, and other key stakeholders.
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	Our risk management team and insurers take these risks into consideration and continually invest in mitigating these acute physical risks. For example, tornadoes and hurricanes in certain regions are closely monitored and mitigated. Other examples include investing in our facilities and infrastructure such as replacing roofs, adding tornado shelters, and investing in improved fire protection systems. We identify and work with our global suppliers that are not actively planning for climate risks, such as increased storms and heat. Based on suppliers' low perceived physical vulnerability, it suggests that suppliers feel secure that their current plans can mitigate the effects of physical climate risks in their operations. However, most of the suppliers we interviewed during our risk assessment stated they do not measure or quantify risks. It is difficult to fully prepare for physical risks and include them in resiliency plans if they are not being quantified. Many suppliers do not plan to add adaptive capacity. Lack of awareness, access to data, or excessive cost of implementation may be explanations for why suppliers are not planning any adaptive capacity measures in the future.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	The impacts of chronic physical risks are consistently included in our risk assessment work. Shifts in chronic climate patterns such as sea level rise, water availability, heat waves, a deviation from the typical annual average rainfall or temperature are risks that affect our people, operations and facilities. In addition, chronic physical risks also affect our supply chain and materials procurement. We encourage suppliers to complete their own climate scenario analysis or climate vulnerability assessment and implement extreme heat and storm resiliency measures, particularly those in the identified "at-risk" regions. Recent climate projections highlight the high probability that extreme weather events will increase. These increased risks have the potential to be particularly devastating to a large, interconnected company, as many supply chains are designed with efficiency rather than resiliency. We encourage awareness and educate foam, plastic, and glass suppliers on tracking carbon emissions due to their high risk indicated in the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs).

C2.3

(C2.3) Have you identified any inherent climate-related risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

Yes

C2.3a

(C2.3a) Provide details of risks identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

Identifier

Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Acute physical	Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

Primary potential financial impact

Increased direct costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification

<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description

Disruptive weather events that require increased capital expenditure to build resiliency: Steelcase has a global footprint of more than 150 facilities spread across in Europe, North American and Asia Pacific. We have manufacturing plants and distribution centers located in areas that are subject to increased severity and frequency of extreme weather events. For example, our plant in Alabama has been threatened by tornados that could result in damage to our facilities. We have facilities in China, India, and Mexico that are also located in regions subject to extreme weather events such as cyclones or floods that could cause considerable damage, and these are discussed regularly by the ERM committee. We proactively manage these risks as part of the contingency planning and business continuity planning by investing in risk mitigation measures and insurance policies. For example, we invest in backup generators should we experience severe weather events causing power outages. We have improved the storm shelter at our plant in Alabama to provide increased protection to our employees. We also created redundancy in our North American seating manufacturing processes by implementing additional seating manufacturing lines at a plant in Michigan, after years of only having seating manufacturing in Mexico. This change was made to be more resilient against external events (e.g. extreme weather, trade, etc.). Should we have increased severity and frequency of extreme weather events in any region, we expect to increase our capital expenditures to build improved resiliency that will protect our properties and our employees.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
Likely

Magnitude of impact
Low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
0

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
2000000

Explanation of financial impact figure
The risk factors and other information included in this report should be carefully considered as they are examples and are not comprehensive. The risks and uncertainties described are not the only ones we face. Additional risks and uncertainties that we do not currently know about, that we believe are less significant, or that we have not fully explored, may also adversely affect our business. If any of these events occur, our business, operating results, cash flows and financial condition could be materially, adversely affected. The financial impact estimate is based on our insurance policy related to severe weather events. As we are a globally integrated enterprise with global operations, we are subject to severe weather occurrences in many regions where we operate, and to the extent that we can we protect ourselves through insurance coverage. The financial impact of these types of incidences has typically been driven by production disruptions, property damage, and loss of productivity of our employees, which are highly variable. We have an effective business continuity plan in place to minimize production disruptions as much as possible, but the scope of our estimate is based on insurance coverage and does not represent all potential financial impacts. Actual costs resulting from an event may exceed insurance limits or liability coverage and are otherwise not captured in these figures.

Cost of response to risk
0

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
Our structured risk management processes enable functional teams at Steelcase to monitor and improve our operational resilience. These risks are already well-managed by planning for potential disruptions and building in flexibility and redundancy wherever needed. Considering we already have invested in measures to build resiliency and business continuity is well-managed under the functional teams outside of climate-related risk, the cost of response is estimated as $0. For example, several years ago a tornado nearly hit our plant in Athens, Alabama. This prompted the discussion of severe weather events as risks central to business operations. Due to the existing risk management processes that we had in place, this risk was brought to the attention of our VP, Global Operations. We then worked with a global property insurer to calculate the probability of future F5 tornados hitting our plant directly. This informed our design of new emergency procedures and structures. Outside of climate-related risks, there are other risk factors that could potentially disrupt production such as pandemics, terrorism, and political volatility. Therefore, the cost to respond to disruptions are not exclusive to climate-related risks.

Comment

Identifier
Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?
Upstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Market	Uncertainty in market signals

Primary potential financial impact
Increased direct costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
Business disruptions that include physical damage to our facilities and/or impact on our workforce that affect our production capacity: we are a multinational company with more than 150 offices and operations located across the globe. In order to serve our customers, we have regional operations that are critical to ensure on-time production and delivery of our products to customers in each region where we operate: EMEA, NA and APAC. Our large manufacturing and distribution centers are spread across the globe (United States of America, Mexico, Germany, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Spain, Czech Republic, China, India, and Malaysia). Any disruptive weather events such as tornados and flooding in any of our critical manufacturing locations could impact our production and distribution capability. In addition, we also have a global dealer network and severe weather events could impact our ability to deliver products to customers on time.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
More likely than not

Magnitude of impact
Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
0

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
2000000

Explanation of financial impact figure
The risk factors and other information included in this report should be carefully considered as they are examples and are not comprehensive. The risks and uncertainties described are not the only ones we face. Additional risks and uncertainties that we do not know about currently, or that we currently believe are less significant, or that we have not fully explored, may also adversely affect our business, operating results, cash flows and financial condition. If any of these risks occur, our business, operating results, cash flows and financial condition could be materially adversely affected. The financial impact estimate is based on our insurance policy related to severe weather events. As we are a globally integrated enterprise with global operations, we are subject to severe weather occurrences in many regions where we operate, and to the extent that we can we protect ourselves through insurance coverage. The financial impact of these types of incidences has typically been driven by production disruptions, property damage, and loss of productivity of our employees, which are highly variable. We have an effective business continuity plan in place to minimize production disruptions as much as possible, but the scope of our estimate is based on insurance coverage and does not represent all potential financial impacts. Actual costs resulting from an event may exceed insurance limits or liability coverage and are otherwise not captured in these figures.

Cost of response to risk
0

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
Our structured risk management processes enable functional teams at Steelcase to monitor and improve our operational resilience. These risks are already well managed by planning for potential disruptions and building in flexibility and redundancy wherever needed. Because we have already invested in measures to build resiliency and business continuity is well managed under the functional teams outside of climate-related risk, the cost of response is estimated as $0. For example, in 2013 we had several close calls with suppliers failing to deliver to us raw materials due to extreme weather and our suppliers' financial health. Due to our existing risk management structure, our Vice President of Procurement was able to identify this as a serious risk going forward. Working with our Senior Risk Officer, the Vice President of Procurement was able to create a global supplier scorecard that evaluated the quality of a supplier based on several factors including financial stability. Outside of climate-related risks, there are other risk factors that will potentially disrupt our production such as pandemics, terrorism and political volatility. Therefore, the cost to respond to disruptions are not exclusive to climate-related risks.

Comment

Identifier
Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?
Please select

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation	Carbon pricing mechanisms

Primary potential financial impact
Increased indirect (operating) costs

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
As we predict potential changes in policies and compliance expectations, the cost of traditional energy procurement may increase during the transition to a low carbon economy. These cost changes may influence on our operating expenses prior to transitioning to low carbon energy alternatives. We are a global company with presence in North America, Europe, Middle East and Asia Pacific regions. With direct operations and distribution capacities in more than 10 countries, a regulatory carbon tax from any of the countries or regions can have an impact on our operating cost. Depending on the regulation and the region, the impact would be different. Because we have a large presence in west Michigan, we have been monitoring emerging regulations through engagement efforts with policymakers in west Michigan more closely.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
More likely than not

Magnitude of impact
Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
0

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
5000000

Explanation of financial impact figure
We are working to understand how markets will react to policies and expectations for low carbon energy and from this analysis can begin to develop financial metrics and adjust existing expectations in making the transition before costs increase drastically. Recent language proposed in the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act suggested setting a $52/mtCO2e price on carbon. Under the current level of emissions, we estimated that the maximum financial impact to us could be approximately $5million (estimated from our gross global scope 1 and scope 2 emissions and multiplied with a $52/mtCO2e). However, this figure is estimated and highly uncertain, and dependent upon regional application and relevance.

Cost of response to risk

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
We also take a portfolio approach to managing our energy and emissions which allows us to harness the net benefits from our energy reductions and re-invest in further

emission reductions. Therefore, we anticipate that the net cost of response to this risk is $0. For example, through the management of our global energy portfolio we understand the market variables and the associated real costs. We invest in renewable energy through the procurement of environmental attribute certificates and RECs from our virtual power purchase agreement (vPPA) and are beginning to invest in onsite renewable energy as we continue to monitor and protect against uncertainty in fossil fuel markets. We have also set several emission reduction goals for our company that will continue to reduce the impact of potential future carbon pricing policies. For example, in 2020 we set multiple new science-based targets to drastically reduce our emissions (reduce emissions from operations by 50% by 2030, reduce emissions from business travel by 14% by 2030, and reduce emissions from waste generated in operations by 14% by 2030) which mitigates the cost to respond to this risk.

Comment

C2.4

(C2.4) Have you identified any climate-related opportunities with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?
Yes

C2.4a

(C2.4a) Provide details of opportunities identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

Identifier
Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?
Direct operations

Opportunity type
Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver
Move to more efficient buildings

Primary potential financial impact
Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description
As of 2020, Steelcase is operationally carbon neutral. We achieved this milestone through a combination of absolute reduction of scope 1 and scope 2 emissions, and procurement of market-based instruments such as renewable energy credits and carbon offsets. We have also set ambitious science-based targets to drastically reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by 50% by 2030. Improving energy efficiency in our buildings and operations has been identified as an opportunity to reduce emissions. As we reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions, our reliance on market-based instruments decreases, while we reduce costs and maintain carbon neutrality.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
Likely

Magnitude of impact
Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
0

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
6000000

Explanation of financial impact figure
The financial impact of this opportunity is estimated through our anticipated reduction in scope 1 and scope 2 emissions and the average cost of market-based environmental attribute certificates. We expect to reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by 60,000 metrics tons. The average cost of environmental attribute certificates are highly volatile, and the estimate reflects a likely range of possibilities.

Cost to realize opportunity

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
There is no cost to realize this opportunity. As we reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions, we will naturally need to procure less market-based instruments to maintain operational carbon neutrality. There is a cost, however, to reduce our emissions and it is further explained in opportunity 2. For example, in 2020 we set a new target to drastically reduce our emissions from operations by 50% by 2030. This will greatly reduce our need going forward to purchase environmental attribute certificates and carbon offsets. In the steps we take to achieve this goal, we will also reduce the energy and power consumption of our facilities, which will generate additional cost reductions, making the net cost to realize this opportunity $0. In FY22, we invested in a number of projects that reduced our energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions. These projects also resulted in cost savings. Examples include the re-lamping of our seating plant in Michigan which saved 850 mtCO2e per year and the paint line washer temperature optimization at our plant in Alabama , which resulted in a savings of 180 mtCO2e per year.

Comment

Identifier
Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type
Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver
Move to more efficient buildings

Primary potential financial impact
Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description
We have set ambitious science-based targets to drastically reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions to reduce 50% by 2030. Improving energy efficiency at our buildings has been identified as a major opportunity that will not only will help us reach the emissions reduction target, but also help reduce our spend on energy.

Time horizon
Medium-term

Likelihood
Virtually certain

Magnitude of impact
Medium-high

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
3000000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
8000000

Explanation of financial impact figure
Over the ten-year period encompassing our science-based target, we planned to invest in energy efficiency projects which were forecasted to total a net investment of $3-8 million dollars.

Cost to realize opportunity

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
We have begun to identify a broad range of energy efficiency opportunities through both internal and external expertise and will be implementing projects on an annual basis over the next eight years, targeting two projects per year. We estimated the total capital cost to implement these 20 projects to be $8-$10 million, based on project estimations. For example, in 2020 we completed an energy savings project in our Kentwood Plant to replace our facility's overhead lighting with more efficient bulbs. Based on raw materials and labor, the project was quoted to cost $26,000. Upon completion, this project generated $87,000 in cost savings. This is only one project in a long list that we have in our pipeline.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Does your organization's strategy include a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world?

Row 1

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

Publicly available transition plan
Yes

Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your transition plan
We do not have a feedback mechanism in place, and we do not plan to introduce one within the next two years

Description of feedback mechanism
<Not Applicable>

Frequency of feedback collection
<Not Applicable>

Attach any relevant documents which detail your transition plan (optional)
https://www.steelcase.com/research/articles/topics/sustainability/2021-impact-report-executive-welcome/

Explain why your organization does not have a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world and any plans to develop one in the future
<Not Applicable>

Explain why climate-related risks and opportunities have not influenced your strategy
<Not Applicable>

C3.2

(C3.2) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?

	Use of climate-related scenario analysis to inform strategy	Primary reason why your organization does not use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy	Explain why your organization does not use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy and any plans to use it in the future
Row 1	Yes, qualitative and quantitative	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C3.2a

(C3.2a) Provide details of your organization's use of climate-related scenario analysis.

Climate-related scenario	Scenario analysis coverage	Temperature alignment of scenario	Parameters, assumptions, analytical choices
Physical climate scenarios RCP 1.9	Country/area	<Not Applicable>	Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) are commonly used for climate scenario analysis. It is important to note that RCPs do not include socioeconomic factors. More recently, companies are beginning to use Shared Socioeconomic Pathway (SSP) scenarios to use socioeconomic factors to inform their climate transition risk. SSP1 (RCP1.9), "Taking the Green Road," posed low challenges to mitigation and low challenges to adaptation. There is an emphasis on human well-being and global population peaks mid-century. Environmentally friendly technologies and renewable energy are ubiquitous. Strong and flexible institutions on global, regional, and national level. SSP 1 is the highest risk for Steelcase, followed by SSP 3 and then SSP 5. The main driver of SSP 1 risk is policy. This risk could come from international or domestic policy legislating intense carbon reduction that requires significant technological advancement. Another possibility is more restrictive legal structures that prevent Steelcase from continuing its growth by artificially limiting markets to accomplish sustainability goals. SSP 3 has a higher market risk than SSP 5 due to regional restrictions (both regulatory and market-based), making it more difficult to access and retain customers. Lastly, SSP 5 presents the least business risk to Steelcase due to the worldwide increase in GDP and spending that comes with heavy fossil-fuel development. Greatest material input risks over the three SSP scenarios include: textiles, urethane foam, plastics, steel, and glass. From the analysis we performed, the greatest risk for Steelcase in SSP1 is lack of implementation of circular economy. For Steelcase, more efficient consumption might lead to a decrease in office furniture sales, as companies are less willing to replace functioning goods, and an increase in personal furniture purchases as consumers understand that high quality leads to smaller overall consumption. To commercialize this mindset shift, Steelcase is developing a circular economy program in which low consumption, high value goods become a driver of sales for the company.
Physical climate scenarios RCP 4.5	Country/area	<Not Applicable>	SSP3 (RCP4.5), "A Rocky Road," poses high challenges to mitigation and high challenges to adaptation. Population growth continues with high growth in developing countries and an emphasis on national issues due to regional conflicts and nationalism. Economic development is slow and fossil fuel dependency is high. Weak global institutions and little international trade. From the analysis we performed, the greatest risk for Steelcase in SSP3 is disruptions in international trade which will hamper supply chain stability.
Physical climate scenarios RCP 8.5	Country/area	<Not Applicable>	SSP5 (RCP8.5), "Taking the Highway," poses high challenges to mitigation and low challenges to adaptation. Global population peaks mid-century with an emphasis on economic growth and technological progress. Global adoption of resource and energy intensive lifestyles. From the analysis we performed, the greatest risk for Steelcase in SSP5 is technological advancements that will outpace Steelcase's capabilities.

C3.2b

(C3.2b) Provide details of the focal questions your organization seeks to address by using climate-related scenario analysis, and summarize the results with respect to these questions.

Row 1

Focal questions

What can Steelcase learn from climate-related scenario analysis? How will we be affected when we consider physical and transition risks? Beyond the science and urgency of climate change, we understand that as strategies are implemented by external stakeholders to adapt and mitigate, pressure will increase from regulatory, investor, and customer perspectives for Steelcase to do the same. Specifically regarding regulatory uncertainty, we conducted a quantitative scenario analysis. We considered the financial impacts climate legislation would have on our business over the medium and long term in regions where we operate and specifically in the United States and in Michigan, where most of our operations and therefore emissions are concentrated. Where necessary, we also considered sea level rise, ocean acidification, increased frequency of wildfires, and decreased availability of fresh water. Implementing these risks into a strategic management plan and quantifying the financial impact of these physical risks on the income sheet, balance sheet, and cash flow statements will be considered as next steps.

Results of the climate-related scenario analysis with respect to the focal questions

To ensure Steelcase climate risk scenario analyses are aligned with TCFD recommendations of variable diversity and 2°C scenario, we selected RCP 2.6, RCP 6.0 and RCP 8.5 to represent decreasing emissions, stabilizing emissions, and increasing emissions, respectively. The results of the analysis showed that consumer sustainability requirements and high focus on green policy means a circular economy will be necessary to consider. It is also clear that rough international trade and slow economic development make domestic supply chains key to continued success, and that by focusing on high quality consumer goods that outpace competitors' innovations we will capture market share. Our main inputs for the scenario analysis included scope 1 and scope 2 emissions, as well as the most recent proposed climate legislation language on carbon pricing; we also improved our scope 3 calculation methodologies for our largest scope 3 activities including purchased goods and services. We now have better confidence on the impact that changing legislation could have on our operations. By identifying the risks through quantitative analysis, we were able to provide a forecasted financial impact that informed the approval of the carbon strategy to drastically reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions. The West Coast region scored among the highest for storm, flooding, and extreme heat risks. The two largest risks for Steelcase customers, supply chain, and operated/owned facilities are storm and extreme heat risk. The Midwest, Southeast, Southwest and Northeast regions held the highest average risk climate hazards. The Northeast region generally had the highest precipitation anomalies under all RCP scenarios. Midwest and Mountain regions had highest temperature anomalies in RCP 6.0 and 8.5. The cost of energy usage is expected to increase under each scenario, with the highest expected cost to be under RCP 8.5. This is due to an increased number of extreme heat days leading to a greater energy demand to cool facilities. Extreme heat and storm risk were rated as the highest risks, actions should first be implemented to increase resilience to these hazards, particularly in the Midwest, Mountain, and Northwest region. We expect an increase in severity or frequency of tornadoes, hurricanes, wildfires or floods. There is a moderate amount of supplier location diversity. Location diversity will spread supply disruption risk across more regions, thus decreasing the impact of any single region's risks.

C3.3

(C3.3) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy.

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence
Products and services	Yes	Steelcase has a comprehensive corporate carbon strategy with board level oversight. The multi-pronged strategy includes becoming carbon neutral for our owned and controlled operations and our science-based targets aligned to a 1.5 degree Celsius scenario. The growing demand from customers for transparency and carbon neutral products along with our identified climate risks and opportunities have influenced our strategy in product and service offerings. This is exemplified by our first CarbonNeutral® product certification which was recently launched. We have been disclosing climate-related risks and opportunities in our products and through environmental product declarations (EPDs). For example, we are applying the life cycle approach to our product management, as well as analyzing climate-risks associated with materials, packaging, end of life management and production processes. To implement on the strategy to reduce embodied carbon in our products, we have introduced design for the environment principles into our product design processes and set a target to incorporate sustainable design criteria in all new Steelcase brand products by 2023. From continued engagement with customers, we understand that reducing embodied carbon in our products is a key priority for our customers and we have begun to implement product-related strategies to respond to increased demand in this area. We started this strategy in 2020 and anticipate continuing the effort at least through 2030.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	As part our corporate carbon strategy, and our science-based targets, we set a target to engage 80% of our suppliers by emissions from purchased goods and services and transportation and distribution activities to set their own science-based targets by 2025. The preliminary results of our climate scenario analysis have strengthened our dedication to this initiative. To make progress against this target, we launched a comprehensive engagement effort to better understand and evaluate climate-related risks and opportunities in our supply chain. We conducted a supplier screening analysis to identify suppliers that represent the biggest contributions to our scope 3 emissions and/or biggest opportunity to reduce their emissions. We also developed supply chain engagement platforms/tools that allow us to gather data from our suppliers, and to educate, engage, and empower our supply chain. The first leg of implementing this strategy is from 2020 to 2025, and we anticipate continuing supplier engagement beyond this time. We have also experienced significant supply chain disruptions this year that have influenced our strategy to improve resiliency. As such, we have conducted interviews with key suppliers to understand their preparedness with managing climate-related risks. The data collected is used to inform our own strategy and climate scenario analysis, and to improve supply chain resiliency. The time horizon for supplier interviews and data gathering is anticipated to be from 2020 to 2025.
Investment in R&D	Yes	Climate-related risks and opportunities have been considered among other factors in our R&D decisions. For example, as customer demand for low emission products increases, we are exploring innovative ways to reduce embodied carbon in our products through new designs, innovative materials, etc. We have set a target to incorporate sustainable design criteria in all new Steelcase brand products by 2023. In addition, to better protect us against production disruptions, for example, physical damage to properties due to severe weather events, we have invested in a new innovative production system that allows us to easily move a production line from one location to another. Improving operational resiliency is part of the FY22 strategic priority.
Operations	Yes	We have evaluated the risk of increased operational costs for our company. One example coming from our identified climate-related risks and opportunities is examining what it will mean to our business if there is a carbon fee implemented. For example, a carbon price of $52/ton would translate to an incremental operational cost in the millions per year for direct Steelcase operations. This helped drive the strategic decision to commit to reducing our absolute scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by 50% by 2030 through the setting of science-based targets and becoming operationally carbon neutral in 2020. As part of this commitment, we have established an oversight committee comprised of senior leadership. We've also expanded ROI expectations to better fit anticipated energy efficiency project schedules and longer-term investment profiles, as well as investing in onsite renewable energy projects for top emitting facilities. The time horizon for this strategy is from 2020 to 2030.

C3.4

(C3.4) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	Revenues Direct costs Indirect costs Capital expenditures Capital allocation Acquisitions and divestments Assets Liabilities	Climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced our financial planning in several ways. First, with growing customer awareness and demand around climate change and ESG, we believe that our efforts in climate related risks and opportunities give us a competitive advantage that will increase our revenue streams. More specifically, customer demands have influenced our strategy to set science-based targets to reduce emissions from 2020 to 2030, and therefore influenced our financial planning process, including our annual budgeting process, to reach this target. In addition, as we consider the financial implications of higher operating costs associated with a dependence on fossil fuels, and a potential carbon fee from regulatory agencies, this would have the potential to impact our direct operating costs. We have completed a study that quantitatively evaluated the impact of a carbon fee on our operating costs (as disclosed in C3.1d) from 2020 and 2030, the results of which encourage emission reductions. To achieve emission reductions, we have planned for increased capital expenditure on energy efficiency projects as well as onsite renewable energy opportunities. Our commitment to aggressively reduce our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions has also impacted our capital allocation. We continue to invest in energy efficiency projects and we are beginning to install onsite renewable energy. We have dedicated capital resources to discover emission reduction opportunities in our highest emitting facilities through energy audits. Our financial planning associated with mergers and acquisitions also incorporates climate risks and opportunities through the thorough evaluation of properties, processes, and associated emissions to evaluate their potential impact on our carbon goals. Contingency planning and building a degree of redundancy into systems has been part of the financial planning process. Our ERM Team uses our time horizons when considering climate risk to inform how we budget for large capital investments needed to mitigate physical risks such as tornadoes, flooding, and storms.

C3.5

(C3.5) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's transition to a 1.5°C world?

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

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

(C4.1) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Absolute target

C4.1a

(C4.1a) Provide details of your absolute emissions target(s) and progress made against those targets.

Target reference number
Abs 1

Year target was set
2020

Target coverage
Company-wide

Scope(s)
Scope 1
Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method
Location-based

Scope 3 category(ies)
<Not Applicable>

Base year
2019

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
47048.5

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
76514.5

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)
123564

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1
100

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2
100

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)
<Not Applicable>

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes
100

Target year
2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
50

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]
61782

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
35473.4

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
55715.4

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)
91188.8

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
52.4023178271988

Target status in reporting year
Underway

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

Target ambition
1.5°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
This target was approved as science-based under the 1.5˚C trajectory by the Science-Based Targets initiative in August of 2020. The target base year is fiscal year 2020 (FY20), which covers March 2019 to February 2020. Target year is fiscal year 2031 (FY31), which covers March 2030 to February 2031.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year
The COVID-19 pandemic and the actions taken by various governments and third parties to combat the spread of COVID-19 caused many office workers globally to work

from home for extended periods of time over the past two years, which had a significant negative impact on global demand for office furniture and our revenue. With a decrease in global demand for office furniture, we have seen significant decreases in our generated scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions. Despite the decreases in production levels, we have pursued a variety of energy efficiency projects at our plants and in our office buildings to help us keep our emissions low as our productions continue to rise. We will continue implementing energy efficiency projects throughout our operations and facilities while advocating for more renewable energy direct supply in markets where we operate and thoroughly consider our on-site renewable energy options.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target
<Not Applicable>

Target reference number
Abs 2

Year target was set
2020

Target coverage
Company-wide

Scope(s)
Scope 3

Scope 2 accounting method
<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 category(ies)
Category 5: Waste generated in operations

Base year
2019

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
8355.2

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)
8355.2

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)
1.1

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes
1.1

Target year
2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
14

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]
7185.472

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
6108.1

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)
6108.1

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
192.104489248783

Target status in reporting year
Underway

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

Target ambition
2°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
This target was approved as science-based under the 1.5˚C trajectory by the Science-Based Targets initiative in August of 2020. The target base year is fiscal year 2020 (FY20), which covers March 2019 to February 2020. Target year is fiscal year 2031 (FY31), which covers March 2030 to February 2031.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year
The COVID-19 pandemic and the actions taken by various governments and third parties to combat the spread of COVID-19 caused a significant negative impact on global demand for office furniture and our revenue. Waste generated in operations is directly correlated to production volumes, and therefore there has been a significant decrease in our emissions from waste production in our operations. To keep our waste generation low as productions increase, we are focused on total scrap reduction for our highest value and carbon intensive commodities, such as wood and steel. Through improving technology and adding visibility to the processes, we are making continuous improvements to the manufacturing process to better utilize our resources and reduce carbon impacts. We are actively rolling out global best practices, such as a scrap tracking playbook to scale impacts. These actions will have lasting and sustainable impacts to improve material efficiencies and better prepare the organization for organic growth. For example, by focusing on scrap reduction best practices, within the past year, the Kentwood Manufacturing Plant has reduced scrap steel by 288,000 pounds with similar production volumes.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target
<Not Applicable>

Target reference number
Abs 3

Year target was set
2020

Target coverage
Company-wide

Scope(s)
Scope 3

Scope 2 accounting method
<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 category(ies)
Category 6: Business travel

Base year
2019

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
13724.1

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)
13724.1

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2
<Not Applicable>

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)
2

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes
2

Target year
2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
14

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]
11802.726

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
1706.1

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)
1706.1

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
625.489883801904

Target status in reporting year
Underway

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

Target ambition
2°C aligned

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target was approved as science-based under the 1.5˚C trajectory by the Science-Based Targets initiative in August of 2020. The target base year is fiscal year 2020 (FY20), which covers March 2019 to February 2020. Target year is fiscal year 2031 (FY31), which covers March 2030 to February 2031.

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

The COVID-19 pandemic and the actions taken by various governments and third parties to combat the spread of COVID-19 caused business travel to decrease and, in some cases, cease during the reporting year. As business travel begins to pick back up post-pandemic, we are focused on engaging the organization to consider not only cost and safety when traveling, but also how their choices can help reduce our emissions. We partnered with a new travel management company which has real-time carbon data and displays emissions by department as well as mode of travel. The data will empower our employees to take individual action and inform their decision-making to help us make sustained progress against our targets. Trip features will now include options such as lower carbon impact routes or modes of transportation, influencing traveler behavior even further. Today, many of our lower cost options also correlate to lower GHG emissions impact which are two tenants important to Steelcase. For example, ride sharing is encouraged.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

<Not Applicable>

C4.2

(C4.2) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Other climate-related target(s)

C4.2b

(C4.2b) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Target reference number
Oth 1

Year target was set
2020

Target coverage
Company-wide

Target type: absolute or intensity
Absolute

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

Engagement with suppliers	Percentage of suppliers (by emissions) with a science-based target

Target denominator (intensity targets only)
<Not Applicable>

Base year
2019

Figure or percentage in base year
0

Target year
2025

Figure or percentage in target year
80

Figure or percentage in reporting year
0.6

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
0.75

Target status in reporting year
Underway

Is this target part of an emissions target?
No

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?
Science Based Targets initiative – approved supplier engagement target

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions
We are engaging 80% of our supplier by emissions from purchased goods and services and upstream transportation to set science-based targets by 2025. Our service suppliers were excluded from our engagement because their proportion of spend was negligible compared to our direct material suppliers. This target was approved as science-based under the 1.5˚C trajectory by the Science-Based Targets initiative in August of 2020. The target base year is Fiscal Year 2020, which covers March 2019 to February 2020. Target year is Fiscal Year 2031, which covers March 2030 to February 2031.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year
To support Steelcase suppliers in setting their own science-based targets (SBTs), we completed an engagement series made up of webinars, Q&A sessions and one-on-one calls with suppliers. The engagement series was well received by suppliers. At the end of the reporting year, we collected emissions reporting templates with valid scope 1 and 2 data from 70 suppliers, which represents 10.5% of our purchased goods and transportation and distribution emissions. We knew in the early years of engagement we would need to focus on knowledge-building and competency as only 0.56% of our supplier by emissions have set science-based targets verified by the science-based targets initiative (SBTi) To improve our engagement going forward, we are hosting separate workshops for scope 1, 2, and 3 accounting. These workshops will dive deep into each scope to provide a step-by-step process for GHG accounting. We will also schedule monthly standing Q&A calls for suppliers to attend and ask questions throughout their journey to setting SBTs. Finally, we are sending out a quarterly newsletter that includes a list of upcoming events for the quarter, additional resources, supplier highlights, team introductions, and other relevant sustainability announcements.

List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target
<Not Applicable>

C4.3

(C4.3) 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.
Yes

C4.3a

(C4.3a) 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 (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	2	42
To be implemented*	12	455
Implementation commenced*	15	2527
Implemented*	40	3063
Not to be implemented	0	0

C4.3b

(C4.3b) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings	Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
850

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
78064

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
25200

Payback period
<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
6-10 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes	Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
188

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur
Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
25732

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
0

Payback period
<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
3-5 years

Comment

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings	Lighting

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)
168

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur
Scope 2 (location-based)

Voluntary/Mandatory
Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
58000

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)
60000

Payback period
1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative
16-20 years

Comment

C4.3c

(C4.3c) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Method	Comment
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	Our company follows the ISO 14001 standard and complies with the ANSI/BIFMA e3 Furniture Sustainability Standard for furniture manufacturers. BIFMA's Standard directs the company to follow the Greenhouse Gas Protocol for reporting emissions.
Employee engagement	We use an employee suggestion program, whereby there is a monetary reward available to those who submit viable ideas that lead to emissions reductions. We also drive investments through showing employee interest and participation in ride-sharing and alternative transportation programs.
Dedicated budget for energy efficiency	We have a margin improvements team that has dedicated budget for investing in energy efficiency opportunities for our global manufacturing sites. Additionally, we have dedicated budget for conducting energy audits at our top emitting facilities to identify energy efficiency opportunities.
Internal price on carbon	We have an internal shadow price on carbon for Michigan-based locations to incentivize capital investments in emissions reduction projects.
Internal incentives/recognition programs	We have an internal recognition program to award best carbon reduction projects of the year and encourage employee participation.
Lower return on investment (ROI) specification	We have changed or lengthened our ROI expectations for emissions reduction projects to incentivize projects such as energy efficiency and renewable energy.

C4.5

(C4.5) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

No

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

(C5.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

No

C5.1a

(C5.1a) 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?

Row 1

Has there been a structural change?

Yes, an acquisition

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

Viccarbe

Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

We completed the acquisition of Viccarbe in the third quarter of fiscal year 2022. Based on our organizational boundary and financial control approach, the facilities and related activities of Viccarbe are captured within our scope 3 accounting.

C5.1b

(C5.1b) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?	Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)
Row 1	No	<Not Applicable>

C5.1c

(C5.1c) Have your organization's base year emissions been recalculated as result of the changes or errors reported in C5.1a and C5.1b?

	Base year recalculation	Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold
Row 1	No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold	

C5.2

(C5.2) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
47048.5

Comment

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
76514.5

Comment

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
0

Comment

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
539569

Comment

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
44355.2

Comment

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

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
28442.2

Comment

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
61556.7

Comment

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
23134.4

Comment

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
13724.1

Comment

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
20804.6

Comment

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
17768.8

Comment

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

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

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

Base year start
March 1 2019

Base year end
February 29 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
191.9

Comment

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

Base year start

Base year end

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

C5.3

(C5.3) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

(C6.1) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
35473.4

Start date
<Not Applicable>

End date
<Not Applicable>

Comment

C6.2

(C6.2) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

Row 1

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

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

Comment

C6.3

(C6.3) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based
55715.4

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
0

Start date
<Not Applicable>

End date
<Not Applicable>

Comment

C6.4

(C6.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?
No

C6.5

(C6.5) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
1521347

Emissions calculation methodology
Hybrid method
Average data method
Spend-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
91

Please explain
We use a combination of the average data and spend-based calculation methodology. The average data method is used for purchased goods and services when product Life Cycle Assessments ("LCAs") are available, specifically for our seating, desking, systems furniture, and storage product categories. About 91% of our purchased goods and services emissions data comes from product LCAs, or data obtained from suppliers. When primary data is unavailable, we supplement with a spend-based calculation. The remaining 9% of our purchased goods and services emissions data is calculated from spend data. Emission factors from the EORA database were used for the spend-based calculations.

Capital goods

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
80200.7

Emissions calculation methodology
Spend-based method

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

Please explain
Capital expenditures were sourced from our internal finance department for our worldwide operations. A spend-based calculation method was used to calculate associated emissions by using the WRI Scope 3 Evaluator Tool.

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

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
20108.7

Emissions calculation methodology
Average data method

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

Please explain
Fuel consumption was obtained from our energy tracking software. For sites where primary data was unavailable, an average data method was used to calculate associated emissions through the WRI Scope 3 Evaluator Tool.

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
65088

Emissions calculation methodology
Spend-based method
Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
We use a combination of the distance-based calculation and spend-based calculation methodologies. Distance-based calculations are applied whenever distance data is available, and we use spend-based calculation when distance data is not available. For distance-based calculation, WRI transportation emission factors are used based on mode of travel. For spend-based calculation, we sourced our emission factors from the EORA database.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
6108.1

Emissions calculation methodology
Waste-type-specific method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
We used primary waste tonnage data from our internal database and applied emission factors from the EPA's Emission Factor Hub based on the material type.

Business travel

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
1706.1

Emissions calculation methodology
Spend-based method
Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Data for business travel was collected from an internal database with assistance provided by business travel representatives. Distance-based calculations are applied whenever distance data is available, and we supplement with a spend-based calculation when distance data is unavailable. For distance-based calculation, emissions factors were taken from the EPA's GHG Emission Factor Hub based on mode of travel. For spend-based calculation, we sourced our emission factors from the EORA database.

Employee commuting

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
18069.3

Emissions calculation methodology
Average data method

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

Please explain
We use WRI Scope 3 Evaluator Tool to calculate emissions based on total number of employees globally at the end of the reporting year.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
21169.2

Emissions calculation methodology
Average data method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Data for monthly consumption of electric power and natural gas at each scope 3 site is tracked through invoices received by plant/facility managers. Where direct invoice data is not available, monthly consumption is estimated based on the square footage of the facility and EIA CBECS data for average building consumption. These consumption quantities are converted to GHG emissions using emission factors from US EPA eGRID and IEA for electric power, and US EPA MRR for natural gas.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
30.4

Emissions calculation methodology
Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
We use a distance-based calculation to quantify our downstream transportation and distribution emissions using primary data from our suppliers. EPA transportation emission factors are used based on mode of travel.

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
We only sell finished products.

Use of sold products

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Our products do not produce emissions through normal use. Our portfolio containing integrated technology, which consumes electricity in use, is increasing; however, it still constitutes a relatively negligible portion of our Scope 3 emissions. We will continue to evaluate our product portfolio as it develops and make changes to our reporting as necessary.

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
44362.8

Emissions calculation methodology
Average data method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
We use the average data method to quantify our end-of-life treatment of sold product emissions when LCAs are available, specifically for our seating, desking, systems, and storage product categories in NA and EMEA regions.

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
160.3

Emissions calculation methodology
Average data method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Data for monthly consumption of electric power and natural gas at each scope 3 site is tracked through invoices received by plant managers. Where direct invoice data is not available, monthly consumption is estimated based on the square footage of the facility and EIA CBECS data for average building consumption. These consumption quantities are converted to GHG emissions using emission factors from US EPA eGRID and IEA for electric power, and US EPA MRR for natural gas.

Franchises

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
We do not franchise; therefore, this activity is not relevant.

Investments

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
We do not directly control our investments; therefore, this activity is not relevant.

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
We do not have other upstream categories.

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
<Not Applicable>

Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
We do not have other downstream categories.

C6.7

(C6.7) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?
No

C6.10

(C6.10) 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.

Intensity figure
0.0326

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)
91188.8

Metric denominator
unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total
2800000

Scope 2 figure used
Location-based

% change from previous year
7

Direction of change
Decreased

Reason for change
The COVID-19 pandemic and related impacts have had, and may continue to have, a significant and adverse effect on our business. We have seen an improvement in demand for our products as people have increasingly returned to office, which has led to an increase in revenue. Our scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions remained flat, if not experienced a slight increase, but not to the same extend that revenue increased in FY22.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

(C7.1) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?
Yes

C7.1a

(C7.1a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used greenhouse warming potential (GWP).

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
CO2	35425	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
CH4	18.2	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
N2O	30.2	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

C7.2

(C7.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region.

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
China	536.2
Czechia	390.9
France	794.4
Germany	620.8
India	2.9
Malaysia	247
Mexico	1629.1
Spain	1620.8
United States of America	27803.3
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	203.9

C7.3

(C7.3) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

By facility

C7.3b

(C7.3b) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude
Athens Plant	5546.4	34.76	-86.97
Barcelona Showroom	6.5	41.4	2.18
Caledonia Wood Plant	3761	42.84	-85.56
Dong Guan Plant	536.2	23	114
Grand Rapids GBC and LINC	1896.4	42.88	-85.64
Hangar- GRR Aviation	2315.5	42.88	-85.53
Kentwood Energy Center	8866	42.86	-85.55
Kentwood Fleet Operations	1918	42.86	-85.55
Kentwood Plant	3378.1	42.86	-85.55
Madrid Plant	1614.3	40.38	-3.69
Meyer May House	16	42.95	-85.65
Puchong Plant	247	3	101.61
Pune Plant	3	18.75	73.78
Reynosa Plant	1341	26.01	-98.21
Rosenheim Plant	620.8	47.84	12.08
Sarrebourg Plant	794.4	48.74	7.07
Stribro Plant	390.9	49.7	13.03
Tijuana (AMEX) Plant	288.2	32.53	-116.91
Wallen House	13.4	42.95	-85.65
Nantgarw Plant (Orangebox)	62.8	51.57	-3.28
Carrollton Smith System Plant (Building B)	85	32.95	-96.92
Hengoed Plant (Orangebox)	141.1	51.6465	3.2313
Kentwood Credit Union	7.5	42.86	-85.55

C7.5

(C7.5) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by country/region.

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
China	3178.2	0
Czechia	2392.8	0
France	205.3	0
Germany	1414.3	0
India	372.6	0
Malaysia	1425.1	0
Mexico	6376.3	0
Spain	964.1	0
United States of America	39141.3	0
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	245.4	0

C7.6

(C7.6) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

By facility

C7.6b

(C7.6b) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

Facility	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Athens Plant	7378	0
Barcelona Showroom	20.7	0
Caledonia Wood Plant	11588.7	0
Dong Guan Plant	3178.2	0
Grand Rapids GBC and LINC	6455.8	0
Carrollton Smith System Plant (Building B)	647.5	0
Kentwood Energy Center	1648	0
Kentwood Fleet Operations	356.4	0
Kentwood Plant	7838.7	0
Kentwood RDC	3173.8	0
Madrid Plant	943.5	0
Meyer May House	45.1	0
Puchong Plant	1425.1	0
Pune Plant	372.6	0
Reynosa Plant	3770.4	0
Rosenheim Plant	1414.3	0
Sarrebourg Plant	205.3	0
Stribro Plant	2392.8	0
Tijuana (AMEX) Plant	2605.8	0
Wallen House	9.3	0
Nantgarw Plant (Orangebox)	178.1	0
Hengoed Plant (Orangebox)	67.3	0
Kentwood Credit Union	0	0

C7.9

(C7.9) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Increased

C7.9a

(C7.9a) 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 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption	0	No change	0	There has not been a change in renewable energy consumption from prior reporting year, therefore the change was 0.
Other emissions reduction activities	6087	Decreased	6.7	We have implemented emissions reduction activities globally (40+ projects and process changes) that collectively resulted in a emissions reduction of 6,087 metric ton (also noted in section C4 - emissions reduction activities). The gross global scope 1 and 2 emissions for our prior reporting year (FY21) was 90,415.10 metric ton and therefore, this divestiture represented (6,087/90,415.1) x 100 = 6.7% of change.
Divestment	0	No change	0	No divestments during the reporting year that have affected our emissions therefore the change was 0.
Acquisitions	0	No change	0	There was an acquisition in the reporting year but it did not impact scope 1 and 2 emissions based on our organizational boundary.
Mergers	0	No change	0	There were no mergers during the reporting year that have affected our emissions, therefore the change was 0.
Change in output	6860.7	Increased	7.6	We have seen an improvement in demand for our products as people have increasingly returned to office after COVID-19, which has led to an increase in production. We estimated our emissions increased by 6,860.7 metric tons due to change in output. The gross global scope 1 and 2 emissions for our prior reporting year (FY21) was 90,415.1 metric tons and therefore, this represented (6,860.7/90,415.1) x 100 = 7.6% of change.
Change in methodology	0	No change	0	There has not been a change in methodology during the reporting year that have affected our emissions, therefore the change was 0.
Change in boundary	0	No change	0	There has not been a change in boundary during the reporting year that have affected our emissions, therefore the change was 0.
Change in physical operating conditions	0	No change	0	There have not been changes in physical operating conditions during the reporting year that have affected our emissions, therefore the change was 0.
Unidentified	0	No change		There have not been unidentified changes in the reporting year.
Other	0	No change	0	There have not been other changes in the reporting year.

C7.9b

(C7.9b) Are your emissions performance calculations in C7.9 and C7.9a based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Location-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

(C8.1) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

C8.2

(C8.2) 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)	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Yes

C8.2a

(C8.2a) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	Unable to confirm heating value	0	189891.6	189891.6
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	123318	0	123318
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	0	<Not Applicable>	0
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	123318	189891.6	313209.6

C8.2b

(C8.2b) 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	No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	No

C8.2c

(C8.2c) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

Heating value
Please select

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Other biomass

Heating value
Please select

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

Heating value
Please select

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Coal

Heating value
Please select

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Oil

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Gas

Heating value
Unable to confirm heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
167164.4

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
118244.4

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
48920.1

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

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

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
22727.2

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
22727.2

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
0

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

Total fuel

Heating value
Unable to confirm heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
189891.6

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat
140971.6

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
48920.1

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Comment

C8.2d

(C8.2d) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	0	0	0	0
Heat	0	0	0	0
Steam	48920.06	48920.06	0	0
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2g

(C8.2g) Provide a breakdown of your non-fuel energy consumption by country.

Country/area
China

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
5074.6

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
5074.6

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Czechia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
5407.3

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
5407.3

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
France

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
3816.3

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
3816.3

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Germany

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
4085.7

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
4085.7

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
India

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
513.4

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
513.4

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Malaysia

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
2144.1

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
2144.1

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Mexico

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
16007.2

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
16007.2

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
Spain

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
4840.7

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
4840.7

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
1156.2

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
1156.2

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

Country/area
United States of America

Consumption of electricity (MWh)
80272.6

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)
0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]
80272.6

Is this consumption excluded from your RE100 commitment?
No

C8.2h

(C8.2h) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity purchases in the reporting year by country

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
China

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Wind

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
5074.6

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
5074.6

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
China

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Czechia

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Hydropower and wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
5407.3

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
5407.3

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Norway

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
France

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Hydropower and wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
3816.3

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
3816.3

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Norway

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Germany

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Hydropower and wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
4085.7

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
4085.7

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Norway

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
India

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
513.4

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
513.4

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
India

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Malaysia

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Hydropower (capacity unknown)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
2144.1

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
2144.1

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Malaysia

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Mexico

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Wind

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
16007.2

Tracking instrument used
I-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
16007.2

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Mexico

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
Please select

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
Spain

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Renewable electricity mix, please specify (Hydropower and wind)

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
4840.7

Tracking instrument used
GO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
4840.7

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
Norway

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2022

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Sourcing method
Unbundled Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) purchase

Renewable electricity technology type
Wind

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
1156.2

Tracking instrument used
REGO

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
1156.2

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
No brand, label, or certification

Comment

Country/area of renewable electricity consumption
United States of America

Sourcing method
Direct procurement from an offsite grid-connected generator e.g. Power Purchase Agreement (PPA)

Renewable electricity technology type
Wind

Renewable electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)
80272.6

Tracking instrument used
US-REC

Total attribute instruments retained for consumption by your organization (MWh)
80272.6

Country/area of origin (generation) of the renewable electricity/attribute consumed
United States of America

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)
2016

Vintage of the renewable energy/attribute (i.e. year of generation)
2021

Brand, label, or certification of the renewable electricity purchase
Green-e

Comment

C8.2j

(C8.2j) Provide details of your organization's renewable electricity generation by country in the reporting year.

C8.2k

(C8.2k) Describe how your organization's renewable electricity sourcing strategy directly or indirectly contributes to bringing new capacity into the grid in the countries/areas in which you operate.

Since 2014, Steelcase has invested in renewable energy credits equivalent to 100% of its global electricity consumption. Which means we purchase renewable energy credits in every region in which we operate. In 2016, we announced a 12-year power purchase agreement (PPA) with Apex Clean Energy for 25 megawatts of wind power with a project in the United States. This latest investment makes up nearly half of Steelcase's renewable energy purchases, and directly supported the construction of a new clean energy facility, and further diversified the company's renewable energy portfolio. The majority of our energy consumption and associated emissions are also concentrated in the United States, which factored in to our site selection for our virtual power purchase agreement.

C8.2l

(C8.2l) In the reporting year, has your organization faced any challenges to sourcing renewable electricity?

	Challenges to sourcing renewable electricity	Challenges faced by your organization which were not country-specific
Row 1	Yes, not specific to a country/area	We are seeing EAC availability declining as there is greater demand in the market. This is a sign of progress but it's not without it's challenges and impacts on price.

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

(C9.1) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

C10. Verification

C10.1

(C10.1) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	Third-party verification or assurance process in place

C10.1a

(C10.1a) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/ section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

C10.1b

(C10.1b) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Scope 2 approach
Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/ section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

Scope 2 approach
Scope 2 market-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/ section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

C10.1c

(C10.1c) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Capital goods

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Business travel

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
Steelcase_FY2022_Scope 1,2,3_VerificationStatement.pdf

Page/section reference
Page 2, Verified Emissions

Relevant standard
ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

C10.2

(C10.2) Do you verify any climate-related information reported in your CDP disclosure other than the emissions figures reported in C6.1, C6.3, and C6.5?
No, but we are actively considering verifying within the next two years

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

(C11.1) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?
No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

C11.2

(C11.2) Has your organization originated or purchased any project-based carbon credits within the reporting period?
Yes

C11.2a

(C11.2a) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits originated or purchased by your organization in the reporting period.

Credit origination or credit purchase
Credit purchase

Project type
Forests

Project identification

Verified to which standard
Please select

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume

Credits cancelled
Yes

Purpose, e.g. compliance
Voluntary Offsetting

Credit origination or credit purchase
Credit purchase

Project type
Energy efficiency: households

Project identification

Verified to which standard
Please select

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume

Credits cancelled
Yes

Purpose, e.g. compliance
Voluntary Offsetting

Credit origination or credit purchase
Credit purchase

Project type
Wind

Project identification

Verified to which standard
Please select

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume

Credits cancelled
Yes

Purpose, e.g. compliance
Voluntary Offsetting

Credit origination or credit purchase
Please select

Project type
Please select

Project identification

Verified to which standard
Please select

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)

Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume

Credits cancelled
Please select

Purpose, e.g. compliance
Please select

C11.3

(C11.3) Does your organization use an internal price on carbon?
Yes

C11.3a

(C11.3a) Provide details of how your organization uses an internal price on carbon.

Objective for implementing an internal carbon price
Change internal behavior
Drive energy efficiency
Drive low-carbon investment

GHG Scope
Scope 1
Scope 2

Application
We use an internal shadow price on carbon for our Michigan-based operations to drive behavioral change. The shadow price is applied during the financial planning and approval phase for Michigan-based emission reductions projects for Scopes 1 and 2.

Actual price(s) used (Currency /metric ton)
60

Variance of price(s) used
none

Type of internal carbon price
Shadow price

Impact & implication
Michigan-based operations represent the majority of our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions and it is important to drive behavior change at these high-emitting facilities. We learned that energy efficiency projects historically have not been prioritized at these sites due to long ROI schedules. By introducing an internal shadow price into the financial planning/approval process, we are incentivizing energy efficiency projects and driving behavioral change internally at Steelcase.

C12. Engagement

C12.1

(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?
Yes, our suppliers
Yes, our customers/clients

C12.1a

(C12.1a) Provide details of your climate-related supplier engagement strategy.

Type of engagement
Information collection (understanding supplier behavior)

Details of engagement
Collect climate change and carbon information at least annually from suppliers

% of suppliers by number
100

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)
100

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
100

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
We set science-based targets ("SBTs") back in 2020, one of which is to engage 80% of our supplier by emissions to set their own SBTs by 2025. This target covers our emissions from purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution. We are engaging all global scorecard suppliers, which include direct material suppliers, vended finished goods suppliers, and other indirect suppliers such as logistics suppliers. Our service suppliers were excluded from our engagement because their proportion of spend was negligible compared to our direct material suppliers. We intentionally kept the coverage broad as we knew our supplier target list would change year-to-year and we wanted to give all our suppliers equal opportunity to set SBTs. This initiative was rolled out as a stepwise approach on our supplier scorecard, wherein this first year supplier engagement was evaluated. At the end of each year leading up to 2025 we are requesting a new deliverable from our suppliers on top of the one completed for the year prior. For FY22, we asked our suppliers to perform an emissions inventory and submit their scope 1 and 2 emissions via our approachable emissions reporting template. Next year, we are requesting that our suppliers submit their scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions and publicly disclose those emissions via a public disclosure platform or on their company website.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
The engagement effort primarily serves two purposes; first, to collect supplier primary emissions data which will be used to improve our calculation for supplier-related scope 3 emissions in the future. Second, the engagement effort is also a way for us to baseline our suppliers and evaluate their progress with setting SBTs. Success was measured on the number and percentage of suppliers who have reported their emissions data to us. This engagement effort allows us to increase the percentage of primary emissions data collected from suppliers and enables us to further improve our calculation methodology for upstream scope 3 categories. In addition, we are also able to track critical information from our suppliers that helps inform our own progress against our supplier engagement target, for example, suppliers' target setting progress. The engagement series was well received by suppliers. At the end of the reporting year, we collected emissions reporting templates with valid scope 1 and 2 data from 70 suppliers, which represents 10.5% of our purchased goods and transportation and distribution emissions. In this first year, we opted not to use this supplier primary data in our emissions calculations as we had concerns with data accuracy in our suppliers first attempt at accounting.

Comment

Type of engagement
Engagement & incentivization (changing supplier behavior)

Details of engagement
Run an engagement campaign to educate suppliers about climate change
Climate change performance is featured in supplier awards scheme

% of suppliers by number
100

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)
100

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
100

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
We set SBTs back in 2020, one of which is to engage 80% of our supplier by emissions to set their own SBTs by 2025. This target covers our emissions from purchased goods and services and upstream transportation and distribution. We are engaging all global scorecard suppliers, which include direct material suppliers, vended finished goods suppliers, and other indirect suppliers such as logistics suppliers. Our service suppliers were excluded from our engagement because their proportion of spend was negligible compared to our direct material suppliers. We intentionally kept the coverage broad as we knew our supplier target list would change year-to-year and we wanted to give all our suppliers equal opportunity to set SBTs.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
We closed out our six-part webinar series on topics that included climate change, greenhouse gas accounting, public disclosure, how to set SBTs, and opportunities for emissions reductions. The webinars were intended to offer the foundational knowledge and resources to empower suppliers to set SBTs. To further incentivize supplier engagement, we introduced this initiative as a stepwise approach on our global supplier scorecard that measures suppliers progress with setting SBTs. Every year, suppliers will be evaluated based on their engagement and completion of our deliverables. These criteria are included in the annual premier supplier award evaluation process. In addition to the webinar series, we hosted a few Q&A sessions for suppliers to attend and ask questions about greenhouse gas accounting or setting SBTs. Altogether, this engagement effort helped provide key resources and incentive programs to empower our suppliers on their journey to set SBTs and help us achieve our own supplier engagement target. The engagement series was well received by suppliers. At the end of the reporting year, we collected emissions reporting templates with valid scope 1 and 2 data from 70 suppliers, which represents 10.5% of our purchased goods and transportation and distribution emissions. We realized that scope 3 GHG accounting presented itself as a challenge for our suppliers, many of whom are small- to medium-sized enterprises ("SMEs"). To improve our engagement going forward, we are hosting separate workshops for scope 1, 2, and 3 accounting. These workshops will dive deep into each scope to provide a step-by-step process for GHG accounting. We also have scheduled monthly standing Q&A calls for suppliers to attend and ask questions throughout their journey to setting SBTs. Finally, we are sending out a quarterly newsletter that includes a list of upcoming events for the quarter, additional resources, supplier highlights, team introductions, and other relevant sustainability announcements.

Comment

C12.1b

(C12.1b) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with your customers.

Type of engagement & Details of engagement

Education/information sharing	Run an engagement campaign to educate customers about the climate change impacts of (using) your products, goods, and/or services

% of customers by number
100

% of customer - related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
100

Please explain the rationale for selecting this group of customers and scope of engagement
We have a formal What's New campaign which is a quarterly launch broadcast that debuts and highlights new design concepts and products. This engagement strategy reaches all of our global customers and has included sustainability information on products and details of our corporate climate commitments. We recently included the launch of our first CarbonNeutral® product certification. In the future, we plan to have at least one product sustainability topic included per quarter. Less formally, we hold monthly Sales Question & Answer sessions and a Dealer Learning series, which benefit customers by giving the opportunity for discussion on sustainability topics.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
We measure success by the number of customers investing in our sustainable products and inquiring about our sustainable product offerings in RFIs and RFPs. Another measure of success is increased attendance on our monthly and quarterly calls, and the depth of questions asked, which can be representative of customer interest and demand for products with less impact on climate change.

C12.2

(C12.2) Do your suppliers have to meet climate-related requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?
Yes, suppliers have to meet climate-related requirements, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

C12.2a

(C12.2a) Provide details of the climate-related requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process and the compliance mechanisms in place.

Climate-related requirement
Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

Description of this climate related requirement
We set SBTs in 2020, one of which is to engage 80% of our supplier by emissions to set their own SBTs by 2025. We are engaging all global Steelcase scorecard suppliers. We intentionally kept the coverage broad as we knew our supplier target list would change year-to-year and we wanted to give all our suppliers equal opportunity to set SBTs. To incentivize supplier engagement, we introduced this initiative as a stepwise approach on our global supplier scorecard that measures suppliers progress with setting SBTs. Every year, suppliers will be scored based on their engagement and completion of our deliverables. We have also included language for our supplier engagement initiative in the supplier START manual, a source of detailed instructions for a supplier of direct materials or finished goods at Steelcase. Due to the challenge of garnering organizational alignment to set SBTs, we knew there would be slow adoption of this initiative. We saw this at the end of the first year as less than 1% of our suppliers had set SBTi-approved SBTs. At the end of the reporting year, we collected emissions reporting templates with valid scope 1 and 2 data from 70 suppliers, which represents 10.5% of our purchased goods and transportation and distribution emissions (13% by procurement spend).

% suppliers by procurement spend that have to comply with this climate-related requirement
100

% suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this climate-related requirement
13

Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this climate-related requirement
Supplier scorecard or rating

Response to supplier non-compliance with this climate-related requirement
Retain and engage

C12.3

(C12.3) Does your organization engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate?

Row 1

Direct or indirect engagement that could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Yes, we engage directly with policy makers
Yes, we engage indirectly through trade associations
Yes, we engage indirectly by funding other organizations whose activities may influence policy, law, or regulation that may significantly impact the climate

Does your organization have a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes

Attach commitment or position statement(s)

Describe the process(es) your organization has in place to ensure that your engagement activities are consistent with your overall climate change strategy

The CEO is responsible for overseeing the implementation of Steelcase climate change strategy, coordinating multi-functional efforts, and allocating capital. The CEO oversees the Carbon Oversight Committee made up of senior leadership and they meet biannually. The Carbon Oversight Committee oversees the work of the Carbon Core Team which meets on a monthly basis. The Carbon Core Team is primarily focused on operations and implementation of our carbon strategy.

Primary reason for not engaging in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

<Not Applicable>

Explain why your organization does not engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

<Not Applicable>

C12.3a

(C12.3a) On what policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Focus of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Mandatory climate-related reporting

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

SEC Proposes Rules to Enhance and Standardize Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors

Policy, law, or regulation geographic coverage

National

Country/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

United States of America

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

Support with major exceptions

Description of engagement with policy makers

Through our Business Roundtable Environmental membership, we provided comments to the SEC on the proposed rule . We provided high-level insights that, with other members, collectively informed the Business Roundtable's response.

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

Our support and exceptions are consistent with those of the Business Roundtable.

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.3b

(C12.3b) Provide details of the trade associations your organization engages with which are likely to take a position on any policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate.

Trade association
Business Roundtable

Is your organization's position on climate change consistent with theirs?
Consistent

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?
We publicly promote their current position

State the trade association's position on climate change, explain where your organization's position differs, and how you are attempting to influence their position (if applicable)
Business Roundtable is an association of chief executive officers of America's leading companies working to promote a thriving U.S. economy and expanded opportunity for all Americans through sound public policy. Through our membership, Steelcase participated in a working group to revise and update the association's climate change policy perspective. Business Roundtable believes that to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, the world must work together to limit global temperature rise this century to well below 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, consistent with the Paris Agreement.* The United States and the international community must aggressively reduce GHG emissions and create incentives for developing new technologies to achieve this goal. Business Roundtable supports a goal of reducing net U.S. GHG emissions by at least 80 percent from 2005 levels by 2050. *In 2018, nearly three years after the introduction of the Paris Agreement and upon invitation of the United Nations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reported that limiting warming to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius compared to preindustrial levels will be necessary to avoid some of the most severe risks associated with climate change. According to the IPCC, meeting this goal would require a 45 percent reduction in global carbon dioxide emissions by 2030 as compared to 2010 levels and net-zero emissions by 2050, which would require significant innovation and global cooperation coupled with changes in behavior across society.

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)

Describe the aim of your organization's funding
<Not Applicable>

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?
Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

Trade association
Other, please specify (Clean Energy Buyers Association ("CEBA"))

Is your organization's position on climate change consistent with theirs?
Consistent

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?
We publicly promote their current position

State the trade association's position on climate change, explain where your organization's position differs, and how you are attempting to influence their position (if applicable)
The CEBA community is made up of 300+ energy customer companies and their partners, including nearly 100 companies from the Fortune 500 list. They are comprised of three member types – Energy Customers, Energy Providers, and NGOs – that collaborate to navigate the complexities of the energy market. CEBA members leverage peer-to-peer expertise and knowledge share, policy and regulatory advocacy, and foundational educational resources to accelerate clean energy procurement. CEBA's aspiration is to achieve a 90% carbon-free U.S. electricity system by 2030 and to cultivate a global community of energy customers driving clean energy. Steelcase has been a long-standing member of CEBA. We benefit from clean energy access and wholesale power markets; for example, through our Virtual Power Purchase Agreement which accounts for 100% of our U.S. energy consumption and 50% of our global consumption. Through our membership, we connect with other like-minded organizations to collectively advocate for clean energy for all.

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)

Describe the aim of your organization's funding
<Not Applicable>

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?
Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.3c

(C12.3c) Provide details of the funding you provided to other organizations in the reporting year whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate.

Type of organization
Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) or charitable organization

State the organization to which you provided funding
'We Are Still In' Mayors, governors, and business leaders first began signing the 'We Are Still In' declaration in June 2017 as a promise to world leaders that Americans would not retreat from the global pact to reduce emissions and stem the causes of climate change. The bipartisan coalition has since doubled in size, expanding to include over 3,800 representatives from all 50 states.

Funding figure your organization provided to this organization in the reporting year (currency as selected in C0.4)

Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate
The aim of our commitment to 'We Are Still In' is to use the collective power of 'We Are Still In' signatories to maintain the momentum of the Paris Agreement and all that it stands for. The list of signatories, including Steelcase, and their collective revenue represents the power of the U.S. economy and their support for climate action. The signatories of 'We Are Still In' share a commitment to elevating the attention and resources directed towards building climate resilience and enhancing the economic and environmental sustainability of the supply chains that power the U.S. economy. Steelcase's focus on U.S. climate action is important because most of our total GHG emissions are produced from our operations in the U.S.

Have you evaluated whether this funding is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?
Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

Type of organization
Governmental institution

State the organization to which you provided funding
The Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce Environmental Affairs Committee focuses on significant environmental issues and work to influence lawmakers to prepare and support cost-efficient, yet effective, regulations.

Funding figure your organization provided to this organization in the reporting year (currency as selected in C0.4)

Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate
Steelcase is actively involved in promoting a Michigan with cleaner, more affordable, and more reliable energy. We do this by encouraging policymakers to consider increased renewable energy, competition, and new technologies in the state of Michigan. Our focus on Michigan is important because most of our total GHG emissions are produced from our operations in the state of Michigan. Currently, the Steelcase Carbon Strategy and Sustainability Customer Engagement Manager chairs the committee and has shared Steelcase's climate strategy with other members to help support climate action and influences the Chamber's policy positions.

Have you evaluated whether this funding is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?
Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.4

(C12.4) Have you published information about your organization's response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).

Publication
In voluntary sustainability report

Status
Underway – previous year attached

Attach the document

Page/Section reference
Climate Change GRI Index, page 53-59

Content elements
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

C15. Biodiversity

C15.1

(C15.1) Is there board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues	Description of oversight and objectives relating to biodiversity	Scope of board-level oversight
Row 1	Please select	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C15.2

(C15.2) Has your organization made a public commitment and/or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity?

	Indicate whether your organization made a public commitment or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity	Biodiversity-related public commitments	Initiatives endorsed
Row 1	Please select	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C15.3

(C15.3) Does your organization assess the impact of its value chain on biodiversity?

	Does your organization assess the impact of its value chain on biodiversity?	Portfolio
Row 1	Please select	<Not Applicable>

C15.4

(C15.4) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Have you taken any actions in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments
Row 1	Please select	<Not Applicable>

C15.5

(C15.5) 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
Row 1	Please select	Please select

C15.6

(C15.6) Have you published information about your organization's response to biodiversity-related issues for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).

Report type	Content elements	Attach the document and indicate where in the document the relevant biodiversity information is located

C16. Signoff

C-FI

(C-FI) 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.

C16.1

(C16.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	President and Chief Executive Officer	Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?
English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I understand that my response will be shared with all requesting stakeholders	Response permission
Please select your submission options	Yes	Public

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms