

# Introducing a Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) Consultation

**Q1.1** Q1.1. What is your Surname?

[Redacted]

**Q2** Q2. What is your e-mail address?

[Redacted]@interelgroup.com

**Q3 (ST)** Q3. Which best describes you?

Product designer/ manufacturer/ pack filler

**Q3.a** Q3.a Other (please provide details...)

**Q4** Q4. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what is its name?

AB InBev

**Q.5** Q5. Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

**UI** Unique Identifier:

ANON-HJCY-M68N-Q

## DRS in a post-Covid context

**6** 6. Given the context of the Covid-19 pandemic we are currently experiencing, do you support or oppose our proposals to implement a Deposit Return Scheme for drinks containers by 2024?

Support

**6.a** 6.a Please elaborate on your answer if you wish.

**7** 7. Do you believe the introduction of a Deposit Return Scheme will have an impact on your everyday life?

Not answered

**7.a** 7.a If you answered yes the scheme would have a detrimental impact, how significant would this impact be?

Large impact but still manageable

**8** 8. Have your views towards implementation of a DRS been affected following the economic and social impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic?

Yes - because of both economic and social impacts

**8.a** 8.a Please elaborate on your answer if you wish.

## Chapter 1: Scope of the Deposit Return Scheme

**9** 9. Do you agree that the cap should be included as part of the deposit item in a DRS for:

Plastic bottle caps on plastic bottles ☐



Yes

10.a 10.a Please elaborate on your answer.

11 11. Do you foresee any issues if the final scope of a deposit return scheme in England and Northern Ireland does not match the all-in decision taken in Wales? E.g. an on-the-go scheme in England and an all-in scheme in Wales.

Yes

11.a 11.a Please elaborate on your answer.

There would be the potential for confusion amongst consumers which risks diminishing consumer engagement with the system. It will be crucial for schemes to be as closely aligned as possible and at a minimum, have interoperability.

12 12. Having read the rationale for either an all-in or on-the-go scheme, which do you consider to be the best option for our deposit return scheme?

All-in

12.a 12.a Please elaborate on your answer.

We favour a system that is easy for consumers to participate in and will support an increase in the recycling levels of plastic bottles. Any system introduced must not have a negative impact on the stability of non-plastic materials. As both Scotland and Wales are implementing an all-in scheme, opting for on-the-go for England and Northern Ireland will create a disunited and fragmented DRS that would create confusion for consumers and huge operational challenges for DMOs, producers, and retailers.

13 13. Given the impact Covid-19 has had on the economy, on businesses and consumers, and on everyday life, do you believe an on-the-go scheme would be less disruptive to consumers?

No

14 14. Do you agree with our proposed definition of an on-the-go scheme (restricting the drinks containers in-scope to less than 750ml in size and excluding multipack containers)?

No

14.a 14.a If no, how would you change the definition of an on-the-go scheme?

An on-the-go option for England and Northern Ireland is not the best way for the DMO to deliver on its legal objectives and targets set by the Governments. A partial DRS where some materials are returned to producers and some materials via kerbside is not a coherent way forward. This route would not deliver the best results on capture and quality of recyclates. However, we do have concerns regarding multipacks and the impact on the beer category specifically needs to be mitigated for as far as possible.

15 15. Do you agree that the size of containers suggested to be included under an on-the-go scheme are more commonly consumed out of the home than in it?

No

16 16. Please provide any information on the capability of reverse vending machines to compact glass?

We would advocate Reverse Vending Machines not compacting or crushing glass at all. Reverse vending machines should take-back bottles in whole, which would allow for reuse.

17 17. Do you agree that the scope of a deposit return scheme should be based on container material rather than product?

Yes

18 18. Do you agree with the proposed list of materials to be included in scope?

No

19 19. Do you consider there will be any material switching as a result of the proposed scope? Please provide evidence to support your response.

Yes

19.a 19.a Please provide evidence to support your response.

We are concerned that a single tier deposit on multipacks will push consumers to purchase larger volumes of higher alcohol products, as well as larger plastic containers. Consumers could decide to switch away from beers in multipacks to higher strength products like vodka if the deposit is applied at a package level. Consumers are very price sensitive at the point of purchase and in a flat rate system, a 12 pack of beer would have



primarily drinking vodka and/or cider. Rosanna O'Connor, director of alcohol, drugs and tobacco at Public Health England (PHE) said: "Around 4.4% of the population are drinking just under a third of the alcohol consumed in this country. That's around 2 million drinking just over 30% of the alcohol. O'Connor said the majority of the group were drinking very cheap, high-strength alcohol such as cider. Our concern is therefore that unless DRS policy is joined up with the health challenges, then the 4% of heavy drinkers will look increasingly to spirits or cider for the sake of saving money.

## Chapter 2: Targets

**20** 20. Which of the following approaches do you consider should be taken to phase in a 90% collection target over 3 years?

70% in year 1, 80% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter

**21** 21. What collection rate do you consider should be achieved as a minimum for all materials after 3 years?

85%

**22** 22. Is it reasonable to assume that the same collection targets could be met with an on-the-go scheme as those proposed for an all-in scheme for in-scope materials?

No

**22.a** 22.a Please provide any evidence to support your answer

This is not a reasonable assumption as there is no evidence to support it or international examples to draw from.

**23** 23. Who should report on the volumes of DRS material placed on the market in each nation?

The retailer

**23.a** 23.a What would be the implications of obligations to report on volumes of deposit return scheme material for producers/ importers and retailers? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

**24** 24. What evidence will be required to ensure that all material collected is passed to a reprocessor for the purpose of calculating the rate of recycling of deposit return scheme material?

## Chapter 3: Scheme Governance

**25** 25. What length of contract do you think would be most appropriate for the successful bidder to operate as the Deposit Management Organisation?

10 years +

**26** 26. Do you agree that the above issues should be covered by the tender process?

No

**26.a** 26.a Please list any further issues you believe should be covered as part of the tender process.

The DMO should be supported by the majority of the producers.

**27** 27. Do you agree that the above issues should be monitored as Key Performance Indicators ?

Yes

**27.a** 27.a Please list any further issues you believe should be covered by Key Performance Indicators .

**28** 28. Do you agree that Government should design, develop and own the digital infrastructure required to register, and receive evidence on containers placed on the market on behalf of the Deposit Management Organisation and regulators?

Yes

**28.a** 28.a Please elaborate on your answer

**29** 29. Government will need to understand the needs of users to build digital services for DRS. Would you like your contact details to be added to a user panel for DRS so that we can invite you to participate in user research (e.g. surveys, workshops interviews) or to test digital services as they are designed and built?

Yes

By continuing to browse the site, you're agreeing to our use of cookies. [Click here for more info](#)



# Chapter 4: Financial Flows

30.a 30.a If any other please specify

Both, Taxable Turnover and Drinks containers placed on the market should be used to measure small producers for the purposes of determining the payment of registration fees.

30 30. Q. What is an appropriate measure of small producers for the purposes of determining the payment of registration fees?

Other

31 31. Is a high level of unredeemed deposits funding the scheme problematic?

No

31.a 31.a Please explain your answer.

This is not problematic because there will be measures put in place to ensure the risks are well-managed. This includes creating a not-for-profit organisation; setting ambitious collection and recycling targets; putting in place a vast network of return points; and undertaking public awareness and education campaigns.

32 32. Which option to treatment of unredeemed deposits do you support?

Option 1

33 33. With option 2, do you foresee any unintended consequences of setting a minimum percentage of the net costs of the deposit return scheme that must be met through the producer fee?

Yes This route is not the best option for the DRS, producers, the DMO or each of the four governments.

34 34. If a floor is set do you consider that this should be set at:

Other

34.a 34.a Please provide any evidence to support your response.

We are aligned with BBPA position on this that for small producers, this could be subject to review by the four Governments and the DMO.

35 35. Do you agree that any excess funds should be reinvested in the scheme or spent on other environmental causes?

Reinvested in the scheme

36 36. Q. What should be the minimum deposit level set in legislation?

Other

36.a 36.a If other please specify

We would question whether a deposit level should be stated and instead would suggest that it would be better for the DMO to set this. It is worth noting that this is currently a major concern with the DRS in Scotland where the DMO is tied to a fixed rate. If it is necessary for there to be a minimum figure specified in the legislation, then 10p is preferred. It is also important that the selected figure is consistent across the four nations.

37 37. Do you agree that there should be a maximum deposit level set in legislation?

Not answered

37.a 37.a If yes, then what should be the maximum deposit level set in legislation?

Other

37.b 37.b If other please specify

We believe that in line with the minimum, the maximum should be left to the DMO.

38 38. Recognising the potentially significant deposit costs consumers could pay on a multipack purchase, how best can we minimise the impact of the scheme on consumers buying multipacks?

We are concerned that the impact of flat 20p deposit on multipacks will see: • an increase in the consumption of higher strength alcohol like vodka • an increase in the consumption of large glass and plastic bottles, away from cans which are a light, valuable and a truly circular material • A DRS become less financially viable as fewer aluminium cans, the most valuable material in a DRS, will be sold and recycled • an unfair market dynamic and a significant adverse impact on businesses that use aluminium packaging and small glass bottles We are also supportive of the





deposit based on the size of the containers, which is common practice in the best practice Nordic DRS schemes. In these countries, consumers clearly understand a system where different pack sizes have different deposit levels. The Government should also consider other ways outside of the DRS to offset the impacts on products sold primarily in multipacks which are likely to be more affected by the scheme.

**39** 39. Do you agree with our approach to letting the Deposit Management Organisation decide on whether to adopt a fixed or variable deposit level, particularly with regards to drinks containers sold in multipack form?

Yes

**39.a** 39.a Please provide evidence to support your answer

## Chapter 5: Return Points

**40** 40. Do you agree that all retailers selling in-scope drinks containers should be obligated to host a return point, whether it is an all-in or on-the-go deposit return scheme?

No

**40.a** 40.a Please provide any evidence to further explain your answer.

Like producers, retailers play a critical role in the success of any DRS take-back scheme. Not only do they make a margin on the selling price, but they are also often brand owners themselves. In addition, retailers will be instrumental in supporting the organisation of the take-back at cost. At the Scheme Administrator level, it will be the brand owners/producers, only, that are to be deciding upon the cost reimbursement principles to avoid conflicts of interest. We believe businesses that sell drinks to be opened and consumed on-site, such as pubs, bars and restaurants should be excluded as it is a closed system and does not pose a litter risk. We must not burden our community pubs with having to charge and refund deposits to customers. If hospitality were to be included, we would also be concerned about potential storage issues and the potential for theft of DRS containers from their premises. Currently, glass recycling is stored in large bins outside in non-secure areas. With a DRS in place, businesses will be forced to ensure their containers are held in a secure location, which for a significant number of premises will mean indoors, where space is already at a premium. The Government must also consider the dynamics for sales via online platforms and the practicalities of return points for containers bought online. In many instances depots that distribute items bought online are not suitable for the public due to remote locations and health and safety concerns. These depots are not designed for members of the public and there are large numbers of HGVs and vehicles. Customers may also only make purchases via online platforms intermittently and therefore backhauling is less viable. The Government should consider implementing a DRS with a traditional retail first approach and then work with online platforms to ensure the system is implemented correctly and does not disincentivise online sales to consumers

**42** 42 . Do you have a preference, based on the 3 options described above, on what the schemes approach to online takeback obligations should be? We welcome views from stakeholders on who this obligation should apply to, including if there should be an exception for smaller retailers or low volume sales.

Option 3

**41** 41. Given the proposed extensive distribution and availability of return points for consumers to return bottles to, do you think customers would be likely to experience delays / inconveniences in returning drinks containers?

Yes

**41.a** 41.a If so, how long or how frequently would such delays be likely to arise for?

**42.a** 42.a Please explain your answer.

The Government must also consider the dynamics for sales via online platforms and the practicalities of return points for containers bought online. In many instances depots that distribute items bought online are not suitable for the public due to remote locations and health and safety concerns. These depots are not designed for members of the public and there are large numbers of HGVs and vehicles. Customers may also only make purchases via online platforms intermittently and therefore backhauling is less viable. The Government should consider implementing a DRS with a traditional retail first approach and then work with online platforms to ensure the system is implemented correctly and does not disincentivise online sales to consumers

**43** 43. Do you agree with the proposed criteria for the calculation of the handling fee?

Yes

**43.a** 43.a Would you propose any additional criteria are included for the calculation of the handling fee?

The DMO will need to agree on an exact methodology accounting for the criteria set. The handling fee needs to be set by pack/container/material type and take into account the recycling value of the material in scope. So, the higher the recycling value of the material, the lower the handling fee.

**44** 44. Please tick which exemptions you agree should be included under the scheme:

44.a 44.a Any further comments you wish to make

Both exemptions are in place in the DRS in Scotland, and it is important to have a consistent scheme across the four nations.

45 45. Please can you provide any evidence on how many small and micro sized retail businesses we might likely expect to apply for an exemption to hosting a return point, on the grounds of either close proximity to another return point or on the compromise of safety considerations?


46 46. Do you think obligations should be placed on retailers exempted from hosting a return point to display specific information informing consumers of their exemption? If yes, please tick what information retailers should be required to display:

Signage to demonstrate they don't host a return point ☐

Signage to signpost consumers to the nearest return point ☐

46.a 46.a Anything else? Please specify

47 47. Do you agree with our rationale for not requiring retailers exempted on the basis of a breach of safety not to be required to signpost to another retailer?

Yes 

47.a 47.a Please explain your answer.

48 48. How long do you think exemptions should be granted for until a review date is required to ensure the exemption is still required?

3 years 

49 49. Do you think the scheme could benefit from technological solutions being incorporated as a method of return, alongside reverse vending machines and manual return points?

No 

50 50. How could a digital deposit return scheme solution be integrated into existing waste collection infrastructure? Please explain your answer.

We would caution against a digital DRS. It risks creating a double system, which would add additional burden and cost to the system. There is also a risk of crushing and contamination in the kerbside waste collection system.

51 51. What are the potential fraud control measures a digital deposit return scheme could bring? Please explain your answer.

None

52 52. Do you think a digital deposit return scheme could ensure the same level of material quality in the returns compared to a tradition return to retail model, given containers may not be returned via a reverse vending machine or manual return point where there is likely to be a greater scrutiny on quality of the container before being accepted?

No 

52.a 52.a Please explain your answer.

53 53. If the digital DRS system can be integrated into the existing waste collection infrastructure would its implementation and running costs be lower? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

The risk of a digital DRS would be that it creates a double system, which would add additional burden and cost to the system.

54 54. Do you support the proposal to introduce a new permitted development right for reverse vending machines, to support the ease of implementation for the scheme?

Yes 

54.a 54.a Do you have any amendments or additional parameters you would propose are reflected in the permitted development right?

Chapter 6: Labelling

55 55. Do you agree that the following should be part of a mandatory label for deposit return scheme products?

A mark to identify the product as part of a deposit return scheme. ☐

An identification marker that can be read by reverse vending machines and manual handling scanners. ☐





Yes Orchestrate timing alignments and coherence of schemes across the UK. Implement a consistent industry agreed marking for bulk contains and add bar codes to certain recyclates. Cross-border trade checks will need to happen if there are different systems across the devolved nations.

5757. Do you agree with our proposals to introduce mandatory labelling, considering the above risk with regards to containers placed on the market in Scotland?

Yes

5858. Do you consider the risk of incorrectly labelled products entering the markets of England, Wales or Northern Ireland via Scotland to be a significant risk? Please provide any evidence to support your answer.

Yes

58.a58.a Please provide any evidence to support your answer.

5959. Do you consider leaving any labelling requirements to industry to be a better option than legislating for mandatory labelling requirements?

Yes

59.a59.a Please explain your answer.

The costs of relabelling and having to separate out products for different parts of the UK are completely incompatible with the supply chains for most beverages. Goods are shipped to central warehouses and distributed according to demand. It is imperative that the same label can be used throughout the UK and the same deposit labelling applies.

6060. Are you aware of any other solutions for smaller producers who may not currently label their products? Please explain your answer.

6161. We believe 18 months is a sufficient period of time for necessary labelling changes to be made. Do you agree?

No

61.a61.a Can you provide any evidence to support your answer?

The industry is dealing with the fallout from both Brexit and Covid, we are also managing the implementation of DRS in Scotland. Based upon our experience, 18 months should be an absolute minimum however the Government should also recognise the pressure on the sector and look to extend it to 2 years. Allowing some relabelling to be done "organically" i.e to coincide with a label refresh would save millions of pounds

6262. Will your processes change as a result of mandatory labelling?

Yes

62.a62.a Please explain your answer.

Our processes will have to change in order to incorporate the mandatory labelling. They would become much more complex, and costly logistics processes will have to be designed and implemented. We would also have to acquire additional warehouse space to house the different lines with the different packaging requirements.

6363. Do you agree that our proposed approach to labelling will be able to accommodate any future changes and innovation?

No

63.a63.a Are you aware of any upcoming technology in the field of labelling?

Chapter 7: Local Authorities

6464. Do you agree that local authorities will be able to separate deposit return scheme containers either themselves or via agreements with material recovery facilities to regain the deposit value?

Yes

64.a64.a Please explain your answer

6565. Do you agree that local authorities will be able to negotiate agreements with material recovery facilities to ensure gate fees reflect the increased deposit values in waste streams or a profit sharing agreement on returned deposit return scheme containers was put in place?

Not answered

We believe that this is up to local authorities to answer.

**66** 66. In order to minimise the risk of double payments from the Deposit Management Organisation to local authorities, where should data be collected regarding the compositional analysis to prevent the containers then being allowed to be redeemed via return points?

We would suggest that Local Authorities need to work through SOLACE and the DMO to establish the best approach to local authority data and management of ongoing kerbside collection to avoid duplication.

**67** 67. How difficult do you think this option would be to administer, given the need to have robust compositional analysis in place? Please explain your answer.

We would suggest that this is adding complication and that the point of DRS should be to capture the majority of materials that are in scope. However, the questions highlight the fact that the Government needs to work with local authorities on this in order to ensure that they do not lose income. This reiterates the point that 18 months is not sufficient time to ensure implementation as aspects such as this have not been finalised.

**68** 68. What option do you think best deals with the issue of deposit return scheme containers that continue to end up in local authority waste streams?

Not answered

**68.a** 68.a Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.

We would suggest that the three options are too simplistic and that this issue needs to be worked through with local authorities.

## Chapter 8: Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement

**69** 69. Are there any other producer obligations you believe the Environmental Regulators should be responsible for monitoring and enforcing?

We support the BBPA response that enforcement should be part of this role.

**70** 70. Are local authorities (through the role Trading Standards and the Primary Authority Scheme) best placed to enforce certain retailer obligations?

Yes

**70.a** 70.a To what extent will local authorities be able to add monitoring and enforcement work for the deposit return scheme to existing duties they carry out with retailers?

**71** 71. In addition to those in the table, are there any other types of breaches not on this list that you think should be? If so, what are they? These may include offences for participants not listed e.g. reprocessors or exporters.

Fraud needs to be included in the table and as we may have different schemes in different countries. Any legislation on the DRS must appropriately cover any issues regarding potential fraud across all four nations. Consideration should also be given to any potential issues with handling fees.

**72** 72. Are there any vulnerable points in the system? Please explain your answer?

Enforcement issues must be sufficiently dealt with by all involved parties – DMO, regulators, trading standards, and Governments – working cohesively. Further attention also needs to be given to tackling the potential activities of organised crime gangs who may look to exploit the scheme.

**73** 73. Do you see a role for the Deposit Management Organisation to seek compliance before escalating to the Regulator?

The DMO is well placed to manage relationships across all parts of the supply chain. It is more practical for the Regulator to receive a case file it can act upon rather than needing to carry out investigations from the start.

**74** 74. Do you agree with the position set out regarding enforcement response options?

No

**74.a** 74.a If not, please expand your answer.

Tackling the activities of Organised Criminal Gangs seems to be insufficiently covered.

## Chapter 9: Implementation Timeline


**75** 75. Do you have any comments on the delivery timeline for the deposit return scheme? Please pose any views on implementation steps missing from the above?

There are misaligned timescales across policies (DRS, EPR and Consistency)





**76** 76. How long does the Deposit Management Organisation need from appointment to the scheme going live, taking into account the time required to set up the necessary infrastructure?

Any other (please specify) 

**76.a** 76.a Any other (please specify)

From the appointment of the DMO to the scheme going live, at least 2 years will be required to set up the necessary infrastructure.


**76.b** 76.b Please provide evidence to support your answer.

**77** 77. Depending on the final decision taken on the scope of the scheme in England and Northern Ireland – all-in or on-the-go – what, if any, impact does this have on the proposed implementation period?

The decision to implement an all-in scheme or an on-the-go scheme will have a huge impact on the implementation period. Implementing a different DRS framework in the different nations will inevitably create longer development timescales, as well as more chaotic and disrupted supply chains.

## Chapter 10: Summary of approach to Impact Assessment

**78** 78. Do you agree with the analysis presented in our Impact Assessment?

No 

**78.a** 78.a Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view

As noted above, a flat rate fee could encourage consumers to switch away from beers in multipacks to higher strength products like vodka if the deposit is applied at a package level. Consumers are very price sensitive at the point of purchase and in a flat rate system, a 12 pack of beer would have an additional £2.40 deposit. By contrast, a 70cl bottle of vodka contains fifteen times the amount of alcohol as a 440ml can of beer but will have only a 20p deposit attached. As the Department of Health Prevention Green paper recognises, "the heaviest drinkers make up just 4% of the overall population, yet account for 30% of all units of alcohol consumed. It is well recognised within the health community that this 4% are primarily drinking vodka and/or cider. Rosanna O'Connor, director of alcohol, drugs and tobacco at Public Health England (PHE) said: "Around 4.4% of the population are drinking just under a third of the alcohol consumed in this country. That's around 2 million drinking just over 30% of the alcohol. O'Connor said the majority of the group were drinking very cheap, high-strength alcohol such as cider. Our concern is therefore that unless DRS policy is joined up with the health challenges, then the 4% of heavy drinkers will look increasingly to spirits or cider for the sake of saving money. This has not been assessed in the impact assessment and this should be reviewed and modelled before the final impact assessment is published. In addition, the impact assessment needs to include the impact on overall sales compared to a no-DRS baseline. Additionally, as the BBPA has recognised, the impact assessment does not include the alternative costs of DRS materials if they were included under the EPR scheme. We are also concerned by the disamenity of litter estimates. This makes up 90% of the total net benefits of the DRS (Option 2) yet is largely intangible and subject to a significant degree of estimation and uncertainty. This needs to be presented with a larger 'health warning'.

ES Email Subject

FI File Upload

Select files...

Drop files here to upload

RT Response Type

Online / CSV 

NF Non-fitting

is a top five consumer goods company, employing over 170,000 people worldwide and over 1,600 people in the UK where, as the Budweiser Brewing Group UK & Ireland, we are proud to produce global and internationally recognised brands including Budweiser, Stella Artois, Corona and Becks and No and Low Alcohol Beers such as Budweiser Zero, Stella Artois 0.0, Becks Blue and Bud Light and Franziskaner Alkoholfrei. We are a proud British Brewer with a strong presence in the UK. In addition to our head office in London, our breweries are located in Samlesbury in Ribble Valley, established in 1972, so will be celebrating 50 years next year and our Magor brewery in South Wales was established in 1979. Our other breweries in Camden Town and Enfield are craft brewing innovators. We are here to champion Britain's iconic beer culture, from barley farmers to pubs and retail. We recognise the inherent social role that responsible beer production and smart drinking can play in society and we reinforce and support that in the way we work. We are a founding member of the Portman Group, supporter of the Drinkaware Trust, and are members of the All-Party Parliamentary Renewable and Sustainability Energy Group. We aim to be the most sustainable brewer in the UK, using innovation to make and deliver the best beers in a way that protects our planet and the people in it. Budweiser Brewing Group we believe that Sustainability is our business. We are proud of what we've accomplished, but we know there's much more to be done. That's why our 2025 sustainability goals are our most ambitious yet. Circular Packaging Our responsibility extends far beyond the last sip of beer and our objective is to have 100% of products



Scotland, a new, not-for-profit scheme administrator that will be in charge of running the Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) in Scotland. We have welcomed the opportunity to work with other producers and stakeholders in shaping the first deposit return scheme of its kind in the UK. Climate Action As of the end of 2020, we now use 100% solar energy in UK Budweiser Breweries. All Budweiser brewed and sold in the UK will sport a new symbol signifying that it was made with 100% renewable electricity. This is part of the UK biggest ever unsubsidised solar power deal. In December, a new wind turbine was installed at our brewery in Magor, the turbine will supply nearly a quarter of the energy consumed and will make 65,000 tonnes of carbon savings during its operational lifetime. By 2025, 100% of our purchased electricity will be from renewable sources and we will have a 25% reduction in CO2 emissions across our value chain. Smart Agriculture In the UK, Budweiser is brewed using 100% British-grown barley, as part of our Bud Farmers programme that has introduced 25,000 football pitches of barley to the UK agricultural landscape since 2014. Interested in joining us for our Bud Farmers programme which seeks to support British agriculture by helping farmers to increase and improve barley yield. Innovation Our 100+ Accelerator is in its second year and aims to help us to help reach our 2025 Sustainability Goals. The 100+ Accelerator will host and provide funding to start-ups to solve challenges designed to create a more sustainable world for all. Together with our global partners, we will create solutions for some of the most pressing environmental and social challenges of our time. Water Stewardship Our breweries are becoming world-class in terms of water efficiency and continue to improve. Water consumption is down by 3% compared to the same period last year; 5% saving compared to the same period in 2017; and 13% saving compared to the same period in 2013). Stella Artois has also been a partner of water.org since 2015 and together have already impacted 2.4M lives through access to clean water.

DS Date Submitted

44344.73663

