

BRAND: KELLOGG'S

Date: 25 July 2024

Based on the provided Kellogg Sustainability Report 2022, here is an evaluation of Kellogg's corporate biodiversity performance using the specified DeTrust Lab Biodiversity Methodology:

Stage 1: Biodiversity Pressures and Priority Areas (30%)

1. Summary of Biodiversity Pressures (15%)

- Score: 2
- **Justification:** The report mentions some biodiversity pressures related to agricultural practices and land use changes due to sourcing of ingredients. However, the details are limited, and there is no comprehensive summary or detailed analysis of biodiversity pressures across the company's operations.

2. Priority Species, Habitats, and Ecosystem Services (15%)

- Score: 1
- **Justification:** There is minimal evidence in the report of a detailed list of priority species, habitats, or ecosystem services that the company focuses on. The report does touch upon some ecosystem services like water and soil health but lacks specificity and comprehensiveness.

Stage 2: Vision, Goals, and Strategies (40%)

1. Corporate Biodiversity Vision (10%)

- Score: 3
- **Justification:** Kellogg's report includes a biodiversity vision that emphasizes sustainable sourcing and environmental stewardship. However, the vision is more oriented towards general sustainability rather than specific, measurable biodiversity outcomes.

2. Scalable Biodiversity Goals and Objectives (15%)

- Score: 3
- **Justification:** The report outlines goals related to sustainable agriculture and reducing environmental impact. While these goals support biodiversity indirectly, they are not explicitly biodiversity-focused nor sufficiently precise in describing desired biodiversity states.

3. Key Strategies to Deliver Goals and Objectives (15%)

- Score: 3
- **Justification:** Kellogg's strategies include working with farmers on sustainable practices and improving water use efficiency. These strategies are linked to the



overall sustainability vision but lack direct and explicit connection to specific biodiversity goals.

Stage 3: Indicator Framework and Strategic Plan (20%)

1. Framework of Core Indicators (10%)

• Score: 2

• **Justification:** The report mentions some indicators related to sustainable sourcing and environmental impact, such as water use and greenhouse gas emissions. However, it lacks a detailed framework of core biodiversity indicators specifically designed to monitor biodiversity outcomes.

2. Elements of a Biodiversity Strategic Plan (10%)

• Score: 2

• **Justification:** There are elements of strategic planning for environmental sustainability, but these are not comprehensively focused on biodiversity. For example, there are no specific actions listed for biodiversity conservation such as habitat restoration or species protection.

Stage 4: Monitoring and Reporting (10%)

1. Monitoring Plan (5%)

• Score: 2

• **Justification:** The report includes some monitoring activities related to sustainable farming practices, but a detailed biodiversity monitoring plan with specific indicators, data collection methods, and responsibilities is not provided.

2. Database of Relevant Data (2.5%)

Score: 1

• **Justification:** There is no mention of a dedicated biodiversity database or integration with global biodiversity data systems. The focus is more on general environmental data.

3. Monitoring and Reporting Systems (2.5%)

• Score: 2

• **Justification:** The report discusses environmental reporting systems but does not provide detailed information on biodiversity-specific monitoring and reporting systems that can support decision-making.



Summary of Scores:

| Stage | Sub-element | Weight | Score (0-5) | Weighted Score |
|-------|---|--------|-------------|----------------|
| 1 | Biodiversity Pressures and Priority Areas | 30% | | |
| | Summary of biodiversity pressures | 15% | 2 | 0.30 |
| | Priority species and habitats | 15% | 1 | 0.15 |
| 2 | Vision, Goals, and Strategies | 40% | | |
| | Corporate biodiversity vision | 10% | 3 | 0.30 |
| | Scalable goals and objectives | 15% | 3 | 0.45 |
| | Key strategies | 15% | 3 | 0.45 |
| 3 | Indicator Framework and Strategic Plan | 20% | | |
| | Framework of core indicators | 10% | 2 | 0.20 |
| | Elements of a strategic plan | 10% | 2 | 0.20 |
| 4 | Monitoring and Reporting | 10% | | |
| | Monitoring plan | 5% | 2 | 0.10 |
| | Database of relevant data | 2.5% | 1 | 0.025 |
| | Monitoring and reporting systems | 2.5% | 2 | 0.05 |

Final Weighted Score (out of 5): 0.30 + 0.15 + 0.30 + 0.45 + 0.45 + 0.20 + 0.20 + 0.10 + 0.025 + 0.05 = 2.225

Concluding Summary:

• Overall Justification: Kellogg's sustainability report demonstrates some efforts towards environmental sustainability and includes elements that support biodiversity indirectly. However, it lacks specific, measurable biodiversity goals, detailed strategic plans, and comprehensive monitoring systems focused on biodiversity. Strengths include general sustainability vision and engagement in sustainable farming practices. Areas for improvement include developing explicit biodiversity goals, detailed strategic plans for biodiversity conservation, and robust monitoring and reporting systems.