Moonpig Group plc

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

09/17/2025, 10:00 am

Contents

C1. Introduction

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ GBP

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Moonpig Group plc (the "Group") is a leading online greeting card and gifting platform, comprising the Moonpig, Buyagift and Red Letter Days brands in the UK and the Greetz brand in the Netherlands. The Group is the clear online market leader in cards in both of its markets and is also the UK market leader in gift experiences. The Group's leading customer proposition includes an extensive range of cards, a curated range of gifts, personalisation features and a next day delivery offering. The Group offers its products through its proprietary technology platforms and apps, which utilise unique data science capabilities designed by the Group to optimise and personalise the customer experience and provide scalability. The Group is listed on the London Stock Exchange. Learn more at https://www.moonpig.group/.
[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	04/30/2025	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

350068000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

GB00BMT9K014

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

MOON.L

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

BMT9K01

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

213800VAYO5KCAXZHK83

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

227558086

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ Australia
☑ Ireland
☑ Netherlands
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ United States of America

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain
☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Moonpig Group has comprehensively mapped its value chain as part of both its core risk management processes and its FY25 Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). This exercise has strengthened traceability and supplier engagement, ensuring alignment with the Group's sustainability strategy and Net Zero roadmap. As part of the Net Zero Supplier Engagement initiative, Moonpig has prioritised high-impact suppliers within Scope 3 categories (purchased goods & services, transportation, and packaging). Engagement is focused on driving adoption of the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), with structured communications, data requests, and contractual clauses to embed climate commitments. By the end of FY25, 28.8% of Scope 3 emissions were covered by suppliers with validated or committed SBTi targets. The Group has set a long-term goal of 67% coverage by 2030, supported by annual progress reviews and integration of climate performance into procurement decision-making. This approach ensures that supplier engagement is not only strategic but also measurable, with clear pathways to decarbonisation across Moonpig's extended value chain.

[Fixed row]

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

	Plastics mapping	Value chain stages covered in mapping
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Upstream value chain ☑ Downstream value chain

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

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

Climate-related risks which are identified as material within this time frame will additionally be categorised as a principal risk provided it is deemed probable that the risk will eventuate. This is in line with our overall risk management process.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Climate-related risks which are identified as having potential to occur during this time frame are monitored and assessed.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

The Group recognises that it must consider and address longer-terms risks as it formulates business strategy.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.2.1) Process in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2) Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process

Select from:

☑ Impacts only

(2.2.4) Primary reason for not evaluating dependencies and/or impacts

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(2.2.5) Explain why you do not evaluate dependencies and/or impacts and describe any plans to do so in the future

Moonpig Group has a structured process for identifying and assessing climate-related risks and opportunities, integrated within our Group risk management framework and reviewed biannually at Board level. In FY25, this was strengthened through an externally supported exercise to reassess sustainability-related impacts, risks and opportunities through the completion of our Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). Together, these helped refine interdependencies, determine suitability for quantification, and benchmark our approach against peers. The DMA identified climate change (including mitigation and energy use), waste, privacy (in the workplace and for consumers), health & safety, and access to products and services as the most material issues for the Group. For areas not already embedded within core business processes, such as health & safety and access to products and services, specific targets were introduced to monitor resilience. Other topics, such as water and biodiversity, were deemed immaterial to our business model but are tracked for their interlinkages with climate and resource risks. While our current assessments focus mainly on impacts, rather than explicitly on environmental dependencies, we recognise the importance of capturing these linkages. As methodologies evolve, the Group plans to further investigate environmental dependencies into its climate risk and transition planning processes to ensure our approach remains proportionate and adaptive to emerging risks.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

Other

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The Executive Committee continues to oversee delivery against the Group's climate-related commitments, including the identification and management of environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. A sustainability related risk register is maintained with oversight from the CFO and reviewed biannually by the Board, on recommendation from the Audit Committee, in line with the Group's overall risk management process. In FY25, we refreshed our previous qualitative scenario analysis of four risks and five opportunities to ensure relevance. This process involved reassessing applicability, consolidating interdependent risks and opportunities, and removing those no longer forward-looking. Where feasible, we conducted a quantification exercise to support TCFD alignment. As a result, the Group now monitors two key transition risks, (R1) carbon tax and pricing mechanisms, and (R2) shifting consumer sentiment toward low-carbon products,

and one key opportunity, (O1) the growth in demand for sustainable and circular gifting. The assessment process was informed by internal data, external benchmarks, and support from independent specialists. Quantification was undertaken for the carbon tax and pricing risk, with modelling showing an unmitigated impact of ~5.9% of Adjusted EBITDA by FY28 under a Paris Agreement-aligned pathway, reducing materially after planned decarbonisation. Other items, including consumer sentiment and the sustainable gifting opportunity, remain under qualitative monitoring given the uncertainty of consumer behaviour and market adoption. The Sustainability Working Group, comprising the CFO, COO, and individuals from Finance and Sustainability functions, continues to play a central role in assessing these risks and opportunities during the year. Mitigation actions are linked to the Climate Transition Plan (under review during FY26 to line up with standards such as TPT and ISSB), including supplier engagement on decarbonisation, renewable energy procurement, sustainable packaging initiatives, and product innovation. Taken together, these actions support the resilience of the Group's strategy across the selected scenarios (Paris-aligned, Unequal World, and Business-as-Usual).
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Moonpig Group actively assesses the interconnections between environmental impacts, risks, and opportunities as part of our integrated Sustainability Strategy, which was refined during FY25 following a comprehensive Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). This ensures that our climate, circularity, and operational goals are aligned and mutually reinforcing. Our approach considers the synergies and trade-offs across environmental issues, including climate, biodiversity, and resource use, and evaluates their implications for our operations, value chain, and financial performance. For example, there is a direct interconnection between our sustainability Goal 2 (Net Zero Value Chain) and Goal 3 (Circularity). Reducing waste both within our operations and at end-of-life not only mitigates environmental impacts, such as resource depletion and landfill emissions, but also lowers our Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions. Similarly, sustainable sourcing of paper and packaging reduces deforestation risks, protects biodiversity, and safeguards our regulatory compliance and reputation. Through this integrated assessment, we can identify high-priority interventions where addressing one environmental dependency generates multiple benefits across our sustainability agenda, while also anticipating potential trade-offs. Our sustainability risk matrix, climate governance aligned with the TCFD framework, and ongoing management processes ensure that these interconnections are embedded in decision-making, guiding strategic investment, supplier engagement, and operational improvements across the group.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

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

(2.3.7) Primary reason for not identifying priority locations

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(2.3.8) Explain why you do not identify priority locations

Moonpig Group has not identified priority locations across our value chain at this stage. While we recognize the importance of focusing on areas with ecological sensitivity or where our business has substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities related to nature, our recent Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) in FY25 indicated that neither biodiversity nor water were material topics for the business. During the DMA, we engaged with key suppliers across different sectors. Most suppliers are based in, and source products from, European regions and from areas not prone to ecological sensitivity impacts. Other sectors sourcing from regions further afield, such as flowers grown in Ethiopia and Kenya, were assessed as being low water stress. These findings support our current view that no specific locations require prioritization at this stage. We will continue to monitor our value chain, and if any nature-related topic emerges as material or any supplier region experiences increased ecological risk, we will dedicate appropriate effort and resources to assess and address it. This approach ensures we remain forward-looking and prepared to respond to emerging environmental priorities in alignment with our Sustainability Strategy.
[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

When assessing climate-related risks and opportunities, Moonpig Group applies a double materiality approach, refined in FY25 following a comprehensive Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). This approach recognises that the impacts of our activities extend beyond our own operations and financial performance, and that sustainability issues can have both external and internal materiality. The DMA explicitly considers material sustainability topics through two lenses: -Financial materiality: the potential financial effects of a sustainability topic on future cash flows, categorised as Insignificant (<2%), Minor (2–5%), Moderate (5–10%), High (10–15%), or Major (>15%) impact on consolidated Adjusted EBITDA, with these thresholds applied in our risk management framework to assess transition and physical risks and ensure alignment with corporate planning. -Impact materiality: the actual or potential impact of our activities on society and the environment, across our operations and value chain. Assessment metrics include Scale, Scope, Irremediability, and Likelihood, aligned with Moonpig's Risk Management Framework. By combining these two lenses, we ensure that climate-related risks and opportunities are evaluated not only for their potential financial implications, but also for their broader societal and environmental consequences. This integrated approach allows us to prioritise interventions where addressing climate-related risks and opportunities delivers both operational and value chain benefits, supports our Net Zero and Circularity goals, and informs our strategic decision-making and stakeholder engagement.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

When assessing climate-related risks and opportunities, Moonpig Group applies a double materiality approach, refined in FY25 following a comprehensive Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). This approach recognises that the impacts of our activities extend beyond our own operations and financial performance, and that

sustainability issues can have both external and internal materiality. The DMA explicitly considers material sustainability topics through two lenses: -Financial materiality: the potential financial effects of a sustainability topic on future cash flows, categorised as Insignificant (<2%), Minor (2–5%), Moderate (5–10%), High (10–15%), or Major (>15%) impact on consolidated Adjusted EBITDA, with these thresholds applied in our risk management framework to assess transition and physical risks and ensure alignment with corporate planning. -Impact materiality: the actual or potential impact of our activities on society and the environment, across our operations and value chain. Assessment metrics include Scale, Scope, Irremediability, and Likelihood, aligned with Moonpig's Risk Management Framework. By combining these two lenses, we ensure that climate-related risks and opportunities are evaluated not only for their potential financial implications, but also for their broader societal and environmental consequences. This integrated approach allows us to prioritise interventions where addressing climate-related risks and opportunities delivers both operational and value chain benefits, supports our Net Zero and Circularity goals, and informs our strategic decision-making and stakeholder engagement.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:
☑ No, we do not identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.3) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not currently identify or classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities. We focus on digital and physical product delivery, using recyclable paper and high-quality ink for our greeting cards, and continue to explore improvements such as energy-efficient print machinery to reduce emissions. As part of our FY25 Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we assessed water-related topics, including potential water pollution, and concluded that water is not currently material for the business. We will continue to monitor water risks and, if circumstances change, will dedicate appropriate effort and resources to address them.
[Fixed row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not consider water risks to have a substantive effect in its direct operations, as water is sourced from countries with low water stress (UK and NL), and consumption levels are minimal (mostly office use) due to our primarily digital and lean fulfilment operations. Water use in the supply chain, for example for flowers, is considered, but as per our FY25 Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), water was not deemed a material topic for the business. We will continue to monitor water-related dependencies and impacts, ensuring we respond if circumstances change.

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not consider plastics risks to have a substantive effect in its direct operations. Since 2021, the Group has used 100% recycled content for packaging and eliminated single-use plastics used for shipping packaging in the UK (FY24) and the Netherlands (FY25), reducing direct operational risks. In the FY25 DMA, plastics were assessed but not deemed material for the business. We remain alert to any emerging plastics-related risks across our value chain.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Carbon taxation is expected to be the primary policy tool governments will use to drive decarbonisation. Rising tariffs could increase operational costs directly through Scope 1 and 2 emissions and indirectly through higher supplier costs in Scope 3. In FY25, we modelled this risk using quantitative scenario analysis with carbon price projections from the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). This analysis under a Paris Agreement-aligned pathway indicated a gross risk of moderate in the short term, high in the medium term and major in the long term, reflecting our significant Scope 3 exposure. After applying our mitigation assumptions, including progress on Scope 1 and 2 reduction targets and supplier decarbonisation, the residual risk was assessed as moderate in the short and medium term and insignificant in the long term. Management also considers it improbable that governments would impose substantial carbon taxes on a relatively non-energy-intensive sector, as this would have disproportionate economic consequences. Mitigation measures include delivering our operational decarbonisation goals, engaging suppliers on emissions reduction, and embedding circularity and sourcing improvements through our Climate Transition Plan. As a result, the expected net financial impact of carbon pricing is assessed as insignificant to minor across all time horizons.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Successful implementation of the Group's Scope 1 and 2 emissions reduction goals should lead to mitigated increase in direct carbon costs. The Group's Climate Transition Plan (under review during FY26 for alignment with standards such as TPT and ISSB) also outlines key actions to reduce Scope 3 emissions, which comprise the majority of our carbon footprint. Under a Paris Agreement Aligned scenario, gross financial risk from Scope 3 emissions is assessed as major in the long term, high in the medium term, and moderate in the short term. However, residual risk (reflecting the Group's proactive mitigation measures) is considered moderate in the short and medium term and insignificant in the long term. Management considers it unlikely that substantial carbon taxes would be imposed on a non-energy-intensive sector in the short term, making post-mitigation financial exposure minor across all time horizons. In other scenarios, such as "An Unequal World" or "Business as Usual," carbon and fuel prices remain broadly aligned with current levels, resulting in limited financial exposure across all time horizons. The Group continues to work with suppliers and third parties to decarbonise Scope 3 activities, further reducing potential financial impacts from carbon pricing.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

5900000

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

7100000

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

7900000

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

12400000

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

800000

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

26100000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Figures for FY25 were calculated using carbon price projections from the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) under a Paris Agreement Aligned scenario, which assumes more stringent and widespread carbon pricing than other pathways. Scope 1 and 2 emissions were assessed as not financially material across all time horizons, even in the event decarbonisation goals are not achieved. Therefore, the figures presented relate to Scope 3 emissions, which represent the majority of Moonpig Group's carbon footprint. The anticipated minimum values represent the residual risk, assuming the Group implements its Climate Transition Plan and successfully reduces emissions over time. The maximum values represent the gross risk, assuming no mitigation actions are taken. The results show: -Short term: £5.9m (min) to £7.1m (max) -Medium term: £7.9m (min) to £12.4m (max) -Long term: £0.8m (min) to £26.1m (max) These figures reflect the range of potential financial exposure to carbon pricing under different levels of action. A formula is not available, as modelling included multiple variables and scenario-based assumptions.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop a climate transition plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Successful implementation of the Group’s Scope 1 and 2 emissions reduction goals and roadmap would mitigate any increase in direct carbon costs. The Group’s Climate Transition Plan sets out the areas of focus which management intends to pursue to reduce Scope 3 emissions. Therefore, the costs associated with this risk response are already embedded by other initiatives (no additional expenditure).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The Group already has a Climate Transition Plan (CTP) in place, which shall be key to deliver emission reductions across all scopes as explained in the previous item. During FY26 the CTP will be reviewed and aligned with recognised standards such as the UK Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB).

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Shifting consumer preferences are expected to play a key role in the transition to a lower-carbon economy. Under a "Paris Agreement Aligned" scenario, there is potential that demand for the Group's products may decline if consumer expectations move decisively towards more sustainable alternatives. This risk is amplified by the Group's reliance on third-party suppliers to deliver emissions reduction; insufficient progress by suppliers could adversely affect the Group's reputation and contribute to longer-term erosion in consumer demand.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Across all scenarios, the analysis indicates that not decarbonising operations, products and services in line with consumer expectations poses a major risk to both customer retention and acquisition. However, due to the highly level of uncertainty surrounding behavioural and market response assumptions, modelling the financial impact of this risk is inherently speculative. The Group is therefore unable to determine a specific quantified financial impact at this time. As such, the risk has been classified as "Potentially Moderate," and will continue to be monitored.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop a climate transition plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The Group's Climate Transition Plan sets out the areas of focus which management intends to pursue to reduce Scope 3 emissions. Therefore, the costs associated with this risk response are already embedded by other initiatives (no additional expenditure). The Group will also continue its strategy of seeking to drive increased customer adoption of its digital gifting proposition, which is also part of ongoing investments and efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Delivery of the Group's climate transition plan (which includes, among other things, sustainably sourced cards & gifts, as well as low carbon delivery) and hence its decarbonisation targets, will drive a reduction in the emissions intensity of its product offering. The Group will continue its existing work on the development of its digital gifting proposition. Progress in this area has been accelerated by the acquisition of Experiences in calendar year 2022.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify: Group Adjusted EBITDA

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

7100000

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

As part of the FY25 refresh of climate-related risks and opportunities, Moonpig Group confirmed that none of its physical assets are currently exposed to substantive effects of climate change related risks. Our primarily digital model, lean fulfilment, and limited owned infrastructure reduce exposure to physical risks (e.g. flooding, sea level rise). However, transition risks such as carbon pricing and changing consumer preferences could impact the Group's financial performance. For example, under a Paris Agreement-aligned scenario, the unmitigated impact of carbon taxes is estimated at £7.1 m, equivalent to around 5.9% of the Group's Adjusted EBITDA of £120.3 m (assuming carbon taxes take effect from FY28). The Group continues to monitor its facilities, supply chain, and evolving regulatory landscape, ensuring readiness to reassess and mitigate if future conditions or material risks emerge.

[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*The Group was not subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations during the reporting year.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.6.3) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not consider itself to have water-related opportunities because its direct operations have minimal water usage, given its primarily digital business model. While water is relevant in the supply chain, particularly for flowers, there are limited direct opportunities for the company to innovate or drive significant change in this area. The focus remains on addressing more material environmental issues, such as carbon emissions, packaging, and logistics, which are more closely tied to its operational and strategic priorities.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Changes in consumer habits might provide opportunities to capitalise on a growing market for sustainable or zero-carbon gifting. In the Paris Agreement Aligned scenario, greater demand for circularity is expected meaning there may be opportunities to take advantage of this trend by improving the prominence of labelling and recycling instructions.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Shifts in consumer habits present an opportunity to capitalise on the growing demand for sustainable gifting and packaging solutions. Meeting these expectations could strengthen Moonpig Group's market position and deliver a positive financial impact by attracting environmentally conscious consumers and enhancing customer loyalty. However, the scale of this opportunity remains uncertain, as it depends on evolving behaviours, cultural preferences, and policy incentives. For this reason, the Group actively monitors consumer trends but does not undertake formal financial modelling, as such projections would be too speculative at this stage.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The opportunity is being realised through initiatives already in place. We are working with distribution partners to support their decarbonisation efforts and adopt low-carbon logistics. We continue to use responsibly sourced materials, prioritising FSC-certified paper. Waste reduction and packaging recyclability improvements are managed under our Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) reporting. In parallel, we are expanding our digital gifting proposition, increasing our range of e-cards and gift cards as part of our ongoing product innovation strategy. Therefore, no additional/ separate cost associated.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our strategy to realise this opportunity is embedded within initiatives already underway. We continue to work closely with suppliers and distribution partners to support decarbonisation efforts, improve labelling, and ensure compliance with Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) requirements. Across our product portfolio, we maintain the use of responsibly sourced materials, prioritising FSC-certified paper and preparing for EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) compliance, ensuring that all cards and packaging meet high sustainability standards. In line with our refreshed Sustainability Strategy (Goal 3: Circularity), we are aiming for waste reduction and recyclability increase. At the same time, we are expanding our digital gifting proposition, offering low-impact alternatives that align with consumer expectations.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Moonpig Group does not currently track revenue specifically attributable to sustainable or low-carbon products, and therefore no proportion can be disclosed for FY25. The Group continues to monitor developments in this area and aims to enhance visibility of sustainability-aligned revenues in the future.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

The Board considers that diversity is essential for Board effectiveness and business competitive advantage. It considers that diversity encompasses a broad range of factors, such as gender, ethnicity, physical abilities, sexual orientation, education and socio-economic background, nationality, country or cultural background, together with diversity of skills, background, knowledge and experience. As of 2025, the Board has 43% female representation, meeting UK Listing Rule targets. It has two ethnic minority directors, exceeding the Parker Review target to have one or more ethnic minority Directors by 2024. It also supports the FTSE Women

Leaders Review's goals, aiming for 40% female leadership. Additionally, Moonpig is committed to improving ethnic diversity, with a voluntary target of 15% ethnic minority representation in its Extended Leadership Team by 2027, in line with the Parker Review recommendations.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

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

(4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

As a largely digital and e-commerce business focused on greeting cards, gifts, and experiences, Moonpig's direct environmental impact is more likely associated with carbon emissions, packaging, and supply chain logistics. Water, while important, is not considered critical in the short term within the Group operations due to our small consumption and discharge, compared to other environmental challenges that are more aligned with their operational focus, such as carbon management and waste. In FY25, the Group concluded its Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) in alignment. Water was assessed as part of this process and deemed not material for Moonpig Group. Nonetheless, the topic continues to be monitored and, if future conditions change, it can be elevated to the Board through established governance. This process ensures that emerging environmental issues, if relevant to the company's operations or stakeholder concerns, are integrated into governance discussions in the future.

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

(4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

As a largely digital and e-commerce business focused on greeting cards, gifts, and experiences, Moonpig's direct environmental impact is more likely associated with carbon emissions, packaging, and supply chain logistics. Biodiversity, while important, is not considered critical in the short term, compared to other environmental challenges that are more aligned with their operational focus, such as carbon management and waste. In FY25, the Group concluded its Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) in alignment. Biodiversity was assessed as part of this process and deemed not material for Moonpig Group. Nonetheless, the topic continues to be monitored and, if future conditions change, it can be elevated to the Board through established governance. This process ensures that emerging environmental issues, if relevant to the company's operations or stakeholder concerns, are integrated into governance discussions in the future.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board receives annual, scheduled updates from the COO on climate-related strategy and delivery against it. The CFO is responsible for maintaining a register of climate-related risks and opportunities, as part of the Group's risk management process. This is presented to the Audit Committee of the Board twice annually. Therefore, there is routine discussion and challenge on climate-related impacts during Board and Committee discussions. The annual bonus scheme for the Executive Directors includes sustainability-related measures and targets. In 2024/25 (FY25) the annual bonus scheme applicable for all members of the Executive Committee and for the Extended Leadership Team included sustainability measures and targets, one of which was climate-related.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

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

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

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Group CEO has overall responsibility for the area. These duties were assigned to this position due its seniority and relevance of Sustainability and climate-related metrics in the Group.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Both CFO and COO are members of the Sustainability Working Group, reporting to the Board directly.

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

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Sustainability Working Group, which includes the CFO, COO, and representatives from Finance and Sustainability, meets regularly throughout the year to review ESG-related topics. In FY25, the Group concluded its Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). Water was assessed as part of this process and deemed not material for Moonpig Group. Nonetheless, the topic continues to be monitored and, if future conditions change, it can be elevated to the Board through established governance processes.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Both CFO and COO are members of the Sustainability Working Group, reporting to the Board directly.

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

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Sustainability Working Group, which includes the CFO, COO, and representatives from Finance and Sustainability, meets regularly throughout the year to review ESG-related topics. In FY25, the Group concluded its Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). Biodiversity was assessed as part of this process and deemed not material for Moonpig Group. Nonetheless, the topic continues to be monitored and, if future conditions change, it can be elevated to the Board through established governance processes.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Group CFO oversees maintenance of the climate risk register as well as all other pieces related to climate risks and opportunities. These duties were assigned to this position due its seniority and relevance of Sustainability and climate-related metrics in the Group.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

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

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Group COO oversees the updating of and delivery against the Group's Climate Transition Plan, including actions related such as carbon emission measurement and value chain engagement. These duties were assigned to this position due its seniority and relevance of Sustainability and climate-related metrics in the Group.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

5

(4.5.3) Please explain

Since 2021/22 (FY22), sustainability-related measures were introduced into the annual bonus scheme for Executive Directors and Executive Committee. For 2024/25 (FY25), the annual bonus scheme included a climate-related target that was applied for all members of the Executive Committee and for the Extended Leadership Team. The target was to obtain commitments from a portion of suppliers to set their own carbon emissions reduction targets, which must align with Science Based Target initiative (SBTi) criteria. Success was measured as a quantifiable percentage of our Scope 3 emissions covered by these supplier commitments. For 2025/26 (FY26), a higher percentage of the same target is in place for all the members of the Executive Committee and for the Extended Leadership Team.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

As a digital platform with minimal direct water dependencies, the Group prioritises other sustainability issues which have more direct relevance to their operations and supply chain. If water becomes a material environmental topic in the future, it can be integrated into incentive structures aligned with broader sustainability-related goals.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For the year ended 30 April 2025 (FY25), the annual bonus scheme included a measure (5% weighting in potential bonus outcome) which required the Group to obtain commitments from suppliers to set their own carbon emissions reduction targets, which must align with SBTi criteria. The Group successfully achieved the FY25 target.

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

These incentives align Moonpig Group senior leadership with actions towards the Climate Transition Plan. For example, obtaining commitment from suppliers to reduce their own emissions in alignment with the SBTi criteria is fully aligned with our Sustainability Strategy and part of our Sustainability goals.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For the year ended 30 April 2025 (FY25), the annual bonus scheme included a measure (5% weighting in potential bonus outcome) which required the Group to obtain commitments from suppliers to set their own carbon emissions reduction targets, which must align with SBTi criteria. The Group successfully achieved the FY25 target.

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

These incentives align Moonpig Group senior leadership with actions towards the Climate Transition Plan. For example, obtaining commitment from suppliers to reduce their own emissions in alignment with the SBTi criteria is fully aligned with our Sustainability Strategy and part of our Sustainability goals.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Engagement
☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:
☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

For the year ended 30 April 2025 (FY25), the annual bonus scheme included a measure (5% weighting in potential bonus outcome) which required the Group to obtain commitments from suppliers to set their own carbon emissions reduction targets, which must align with SBTi criteria. The Group successfully achieved the FY25 target.

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

These incentives align Moonpig Group senior leadership with actions towards the Climate Transition Plan. For example, obtaining commitment from suppliers to reduce their own emissions in alignment with the SBTi criteria is fully aligned with our Sustainability Strategy and part of our Sustainability goals.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Moonpig's Environmental Policy addresses the value chain in three areas: 1) Direct Operations: Focuses on reducing the environmental footprint of Moonpig's facilities, energy use, and internal processes. 2) Upstream: Engages with suppliers to ensure sustainable sourcing of materials, reduction of emissions, and compliance with Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for packaging. 3) Downstream: Addresses the impact of product delivery and waste management, aiming to minimize packaging waste and support sustainable disposal or recycling practices for customers.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

moonpig-group-plc-environmental-policy-april-2025.pdf

[Add row]

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

(4.10.1) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

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

Moonpig Group is a signatory of the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), with its net zero Scope 1 and 2 near- and long-term targets, which were approved prior to the Scope 3 target development. As a signatory, the Group actively implements and monitors emissions reduction initiatives across operations and the value chain in line with SBTi guidance, reports progress annually and aligns its climate strategy and Climate Transition Plan with the latest science-based methodologies. This includes setting interim targets, engaging suppliers to reduce Scope 3 emissions, and ensuring accountability through governance oversight at Board and executive levels.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ No, we have assessed our activities, and none could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Moonpig Sustainability Report FY25.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

The Group is committed to achieving its climate-related targets and ensuring that external engagement activities, when relevant and applicable, are aligned with and contribute to these objectives. The Board approved the Climate Transition Plan (CTP) in April 2023, which is currently being refreshed in FY26 to align with emerging standards such as the UK Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) and the ISSB climate disclosure requirements. The CTP outlines the Group's approach to decarbonising its products and value chain in alignment with the Paris Agreement goal (below 1.5 °C). It focuses on four strategic pathways: sustainably sourced cards and gifts, low-carbon delivery, low-carbon manufacturing and fulfilment, and more accurate emissions data measurement. This framework guides the Group's external engagement to ensure consistency with our environmental commitments and ongoing climate strategy.

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Currently, the Group prioritises internal resources on the review and implementation of the Climate Transition Plan.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Sustainability Strategy, Targets and Performance: from pages marked 25 to 48 (ref. ARA FY25)

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

moonpig-group-plc-annual-report-2025-full-version.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The content can be found both in the FY25 Annual Report (attached) as well as in the FY25 Sustainability Report.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ On a per project basis

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

While we recognize the importance of scenario analysis for water outcomes, it is not an immediate priority for Moonpig Group at this time due to our reduced water consumption within operations. Our recent Double Materiality Assessment identified water as a non-material topic for the Group. Should water outcomes be deemed material during this assessment, we will certainly consider incorporating scenario analysis to enhance our understanding and management of these risks

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 1.9

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario assumes a low emissions future with environmentally oriented technological and behavioural change resulting in future warming of around 1.5°C by 2100. This scenario is optimistic about decarbonisation and assumes there is a globally coordinated effort to reach Net Zero by 2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Scenarios considering 1.5ºC temperature trajectories in alignment with the Paris Agreement. This is in line with the Group work and aim to support global action towards Net Zero, as shown in our Climate Transition Plan

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP4

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Consumer sentiment
☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents a middle of the road emissions future with medium and uneven technological progress, resulting in future warming of around 2.5°C by 2100. This scenario assumes a lack of global cooperation resulting in a disorderly transition with social, economic and technological trends following historical patterns.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Scenarios considering an intermediate option between the NetZero (1.5ºC) and BAU (4ºC) temperature trajectories.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario represents a high emissions future with low technological progress resulting in future warming of around 4°C by 2100. This scenario assumes limited climate action persists, with existing policy ambition levels remaining stagnant, resulting in an energy-intensive economy reliant on fossil fuels.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Scenarios considering 4ºC temperature trajectories in alignment with Business as usual.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

The outcomes of the FY25 refreshed scenario analysis included: A. Reassessment and consolidation of the previous qualitative approach into 2 climate-related risks and 1 opportunity, B. Quantification of financial impacts where feasible, with non-applicable or already achieved items retired, C. Broader integration of scenario outcomes into Moonpig's Climate Transition Plan and environmental strategy. In sum: • Scenarios and horizons: The Group assessed short, medium and long-term outcomes under three scenarios: Paris Agreement Aligned (~1.5°C), An Unequal World (~2.5°C), and Business as Usual (~4°C). Transition risks: • Carbon tax and pricing mechanisms (R1): Quantified under the Paris-Aligned scenario, with an unmitigated impact of ~5.9% of Group Adjusted EBITDA in FY28 (highest case within viability horizon). Residual risk reduces significantly with planned decarbonisation. Minor/insignificant in BAU and Unequal World scenarios. • Shifting consumer sentiment (R2): Considered material but not quantified due to high uncertainty in behavioural and market assumptions. Tracked via trading sensitivity analysis. Opportunity: • Sustainable and circular products/packaging (O1): Consumer demand expected to grow, particularly in Paris-Aligned pathways. Tracked actively but not quantified due to dependency on market adoption pathways. • Implications for other environmental issues: Insights reinforce actions already underway on packaging and sourcing, including EPR & EUDR compliance. These initiatives support resilience, capture identified opportunities and address wider sustainability issues such as waste and resource efficiency. Decisions on how to mitigate, control or accept risks are made through the Group's risk management framework. Outcomes continue to inform the Climate Transition Plan, which addresses long-term transition risks and opportunities in a Paris-Aligned pathway.

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Moonpig Group's Climate Transition Plan, first signed off in 2023, prioritises reducing our carbon footprint and supporting the global shift to a low-carbon economy. While we do not currently make an explicit commitment to cease all spending or revenue associated with fossil fuels, our focus remains on implementing practical measures within our operations and value chain where our influence is strongest. During FY26, we are reviewing and refreshing our Climate Transition Plan to align more closely with evolving standards such as the UK Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) and the ISSB. This process will help us strengthen governance, enhance transparency, and ensure our pathway remains credible. In the longer term, we will continue to monitor whether changes in our approach to spending or revenue are appropriate as part of this evolution.

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

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

The Board has approved the Group's inaugural Climate Transition Plan in April 2023, which sets out how the business plans to adapt as the world transitions to a low carbon economy. The COO oversees the updating of and delivery against the Group's Climate Transition Plan. We are currently working on our Climate Transition Plan to align more closely with evolving standards such as the UK Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) and the ISSB. This process will help us strengthen governance, enhance transparency, and ensure our pathway remains credible. Once finalised, the new version will be sent to the Board for consideration and approval.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ Annually

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

Key Assumptions from the current CTP: a) Technological Advancements: ongoing technological improvements (e.g., more efficient logistics, packaging alternatives, digital platform optimizations) will enable emissions reductions and support the Group's carbon-reduction targets. b) Consumer Demand for Sustainability: consumer preferences will continue to shift towards more sustainable products and practices, enabling Moonpig to leverage its environmental initiatives for competitive advantage. c) Availability of Renewable Energy: sufficient renewable energy infrastructure will be available to support operational decarbonization, particularly in Moonpig's digital operations and third-party logistics providers. Key Dependencies from the current CTP: a) Organizational Capability and Resources: the successful execution of the Transition Plan is contingent on the Group's capacity to allocate resources (time, budget, expertise) to sustainability initiatives without compromising core business functions. b) Supplier Sustainability Practices: the plan involves suppliers' ability to meet sustainability commitments, such as reducing their carbon emissions, using lower-carbon materials, and transportation methods. c) Technology & Data Accuracy: The plan aims for increased availability and accuracy of data to track, verify, and report. Improved systems for data collection, monitoring, and verification are essential for transparency, making informed decisions. Investments in technical and digital infrastructure will support these efforts.

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

-Low Carbon Sourcing of Cards and Gifts: In FY25, our UK flowers supplier committed to SBTi-aligned net zero targets, while in the Netherlands we eliminated single-use plastics from shipping packaging. We commenced implementing the Recyclability Assessment Methodology (RAM) under EPR regulations, collecting data from all packaging suppliers to guide future low-carbon sourcing and packaging improvements. -Low Carbon Delivery: Our Dutch delivery partner achieved SBTi-approved Scope 1 and 2 net zero targets in November 2024. In the UK, our primary delivery partner further advanced fleet electrification, deploying its 6,000th electric vehicle, establishing the largest electric delivery fleet in the country and reducing delivery-related emissions. -Low Carbon Manufacturing and Fulfilment: We enhanced energy efficiency and monitoring at our main UK facility through new submeters, enabling more effective tracking and optimisation of energy use. In the Netherlands, preparatory infrastructure for solar panels was completed under a new lease agreement, with installation scheduled for FY26. -More Accurate Emissions Measurement: The share of primary supplier data increased to 48% (FY24: 46%), improving Scope 3 emissions accuracy. We engaged an external environmental consultant to validate emission factors and implemented two new sustainability technology platforms, strengthening carbon accounting and reporting capabilities across the Group.

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

Moonpig Sustainability Report FY25.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Plastics

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

On the "Sustainably Sourced Cards and Gifts" pathway, we are targeting 100% FSC-certified materials across Cards and Experiences. Single-use plastics for shipping packaging have been eliminated in NL As part of the new Sustainability Strategy, Recyclability Assessment Methodology (RAM) data is collected to embed circularity, plastic reduction, and climate considerations, supporting Goal 3 on waste and resource efficiency.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Operations
[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Environmental risks and opportunities have informed our product strategy by highlighting the importance of lower-carbon and sustainable offerings. The risk of changing consumer preferences encourages us to expand FSC-certified cards and gifts, optimise packaging, and improve labelling on recyclability to maintain demand. Conversely, the shift in consumer sentiment towards sustainable products presents an opportunity to differentiate our offering, promoting our low-carbon and circular product portfolio to enhance customer engagement and brand reputation.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

The introduction of carbon taxes and the risk of reputational impact from suppliers failing to decarbonise have influenced our engagement with upstream suppliers. We prioritise suppliers we can influence and that represent a substantial portion of our Scope 3 emissions for net zero target setting. We do so via monitoring progress and providing guidance to accelerate decarbonisation. Downstream, we work with delivery partners to electrify fleets and optimise routes, reducing emissions and ensuring resilience against carbon cost increases, while meeting consumer expectations for sustainable delivery and capitalising on growing demand for low-carbon services.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Carbon pricing and operational efficiency considerations have driven investments in energy management and renewable energy across our facilities. Energy monitoring with submeters and planned solar installations improve operational resilience against carbon cost increases. Simultaneously, meeting evolving consumer expectations for sustainable practices strengthens our reputation, aligning operational initiatives with broader climate goals and supporting our sustainability strategy (Goal 3: Circularity & Waste Reduction).
[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Liabilities

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Carbon taxation is expected to be the primary policy tool governments will use to drive decarbonisation. Rising tariffs could increase operational costs directly through Scope 1 and 2 emissions and indirectly through higher supplier costs in Scope 3. In FY25, we modelled this risk using quantitative scenario analysis with carbon price projections from the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). This analysis under a Paris Agreement-aligned pathway indicated a gross risk of moderate in the short term, high in the medium term and major in the long term, reflecting our significant Scope 3 exposure. After applying our mitigation assumptions, including progress on Scope 1 and 2 reduction targets and supplier decarbonisation, the residual risk was assessed as moderate in the short and medium term and insignificant in the long term. Management also considers it improbable that governments would impose substantial carbon taxes on a relatively non-energy-intensive sector, as this would have disproportionate economic consequences. Mitigation measures include delivering our operational decarbonisation goals, engaging suppliers on emissions reduction, and embedding circularity and sourcing improvements through our Climate Transition Plan. As a result, the expected net financial impact of carbon pricing is assessed as insignificant to minor across all time horizons.

[Add row]

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

100

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

-100

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Moonpig Group made capital expenditure (CAPEX) investments in water-related management during FY25, including the installation of a water tank and sprinklers. These were one-off projects and there was no water-related CAPEX in FY24, which explains the higher spend reported this year. The Group does not anticipate similar water-related CAPEX in the next reporting year, as these types of projects do not occur annually. Operating expenditure (OPEX) remains limited to utility costs associated with water use across our offices and operational sites, with no major changes are expected in the year ahead.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

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

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.4) Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities

Moonpig Group does not currently apply an internal price on environmental externalities, such as carbon or water. We recognise the value of such mechanisms in assessing and managing environmental risks and opportunities, and we continue to monitor developments in this area. As part of the ongoing review of our Climate Transition Plan to align with emerging standards such as the UK Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) and ISSB, we may explore the role of internal pricing as a medium/long-term tool to strengthen our risk management and strategic decision-making.
[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

(5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

While we recognize the importance of engaging a broader range of value chain stakeholders, we have prioritized building a robust internal sustainability program first, also working with suppliers and customers. As our environmental initiatives evolve, we may look to expand our engagement with additional stakeholders to further enhance our sustainability efforts.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Moonpig Group prioritizes specific suppliers for engagement on environmental issues, particularly through our Net Zero Engagement program where suppliers must have SBTi-aligned commitments. We focus on key suppliers that represent approximately 67% of our Scope 3 emissions. These suppliers are typically associated with our highest spend and include those providing paper and packaging, gifts, services, and transportation. By prioritizing these suppliers, we aim to maximize our impact on reducing emissions across our value chain and drive meaningful progress towards our Net Zero goals.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No, we do not have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Moonpig Group's Supplier Code of Conduct sets out clear sustainability expectations, including Environmental Risk Management, Sustainability Practices, GHG emissions calculation, and alignment with SBTi targets. Since FY25, these expectations have been strengthened through the introduction of Sustainability Clauses in all new supplier contracts, with inclusion planned for future renewals. These clauses require suppliers to commit to setting SBTi-aligned reduction targets (with a grace period to adapt) and, for certain categories (paper and packaging), to provide FSC certification or packaging data via EPR. This contractual approach builds on our established practices of sourcing 100% of paper, packaging, and envelopes from suppliers with sustainable credentials. By combining clear expectations with binding requirements, we are reinforcing accountability in our value chain and accelerating progress towards our climate and circularity goals.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Certification

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

☑ Re-integrating suppliers back into upstream value chain based on the successful and verifiable completion of activities

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Since FY25, Moonpig Group has introduced Sustainability Clauses into all new supplier contracts, with the intention of extending these to future renewals. While currently covering a small proportion of Tier 1 suppliers by revenue, these clauses require suppliers to commit to setting SBTi-aligned emissions reduction targets, with a grace period to prepare accordingly. For relevant categories, they also include requirements such as FSC certification or provision of EPR data. These clauses directly support our Sustainability Strategy Goal 2 (Net Zero value chain emissions), which aims to obtain SBTi-aligned commitment from suppliers representing 67% of our Scope 3 emissions. Compliance is currently driven through supplier monitoring and ongoing dialogue & engagement, with plans to expand into more structured capacity-building support in future reporting cycles. This approach balances contractual accountability with practical engagement, ensuring suppliers are both incentivised and supported to take their first steps towards our shared climate objectives.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Moonpig Group values making customers aware of the work we have been doing on climate change. In FY22 we used Earth Day to leverage the information through our website and social channels. In FY23 we started to share information about our products and relevant certification schemes. In FY24 we did a Tree Planting Day in London, planting more than 500 units to celebrate Earth Day. In FY25 we engaged with Customer Representatives to help us during the Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), which was the foundation of our refreshed Sustainability Strategy. For future years we aim to continue the dialogue with our customers and raise even more awareness for environmental causes.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Future measures of success will be considered along with the defined climate-related customer engagement campaign.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Moonpig engages with investors primarily to provide transparency and respond to inbound requests for information on sustainability matters. Engagement is conducted on an ad hoc basis with specific institutions, typically led by the CFO, to address material sustainability topics and ensure alignment with investor expectations.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

These engagements help Moonpig understand investor perspectives on sustainability, inform disclosures and strengthen trust with key stakeholders. Success is measured by the quality of feedback received, continued investor interest and our ability to reflect stakeholder input in disclosures and reporting.
[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Moonpig Group uses the Operational Control approach for the calculation of our environmental performance data, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and other environmental impacts. This approach is in line with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol, and it allows us to account for 100% of the emissions from operations where we have the authority to introduce and implement operational policies. By using this method, we ensure that our environmental performance data reflects the activities and resources over which we have direct control, providing a clear picture of our operational impact. This approach also enables us to make more effective decisions regarding resource management and emission reduction strategies.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Moonpig Group uses the Operational Control approach for the calculation of water-related data, following the same principles as applied in our greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions accounting. This approach ensures that we account for 100% of the water-related impacts from operations where we have the authority to implement operational policies. Our Double Materiality Assessment identified water as a non-material topic for our business, given our limited direct interaction with significant water use. Nevertheless, we continue to collect data on our operational footprint and acknowledge the relevance of water impacts in a global context. This approach ensures we remain responsive to evolving regulatory requirements, stakeholder expectations, and potential future changes in our value chain.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Moonpig Group uses the Operational Control approach for the calculation of plastic-related data. This is particularly relevant to our waste packaging management, where we collect data in line with Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) requirements. By using this approach, we account for 100% of the plastics-related impacts from operations where we have direct control. We have also made significant progress by phasing out single-use shipping plastics within our operations, which reflects our ongoing commitment to reducing plastic waste. While plastic-related data is not as comprehensive as other environmental metrics, we continue to build our capabilities in this area to better understand and manage our plastic use and its associated impacts.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Not consolidated yet

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

Moonpig Group has not yet adopted a formal consolidation approach for the calculation of biodiversity-related data. While our Double Materiality Assessment identified biodiversity as a non-material topic for our business, we recognise its critical importance to global environmental health. Our current sustainability efforts are focused on areas where we have more direct operational impact, such as climate action and resource efficiency. Nevertheless, we continue to monitor developments and remain attentive to potential future changes in our value chain or stakeholder expectations that may warrant a stronger focus on biodiversity.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

(7.3) Describe your organization’s approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*We have both Location and Market based GHG information to disclose.*

[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Non-routine replenishment of refrigerant gas in the closed HVAC system at our Tamworth facility (UK), measured as 71 tCO_2e.

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

11.8

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

This was a one-off, non-routine activity that is not expected to recur and is therefore not considered representative of our ongoing operational emissions profile. To maintain a consistent and accurate baseline for future performance tracking, we adjusted Scope 1 emissions to exclude this exceptional event.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

The excluded refrigerant emissions were calculated at 71 tCO_2e. This figure was compared against our total Scope 1 and 2 (location-based) emissions including the one-off event (601 tCO_2e). The exclusion therefore represents approximately 11.8% of combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions. After exclusion, reported Scope 1 and 2 (location-based) emissions were 530 tCO_2e.
[Add row]

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

159.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This includes natural gas consumption from Moonpig, Greetz and the Experiences Division (Experience More Limited, which operates the Red Letter Days and Buyagift brands and was acquired in July 2022).

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

518

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This includes electricity consumption from Moonpig, Greetz and the Experiences Division (Experience More Limited, which operates the Red Letter Days and Buyagift brands and was acquired in July 2022).

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

518

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This includes electricity consumption from Moonpig, Greetz and the Experiences Division (Experience More Limited, which operates the Red Letter Days and Buyagift brands and was acquired in July 2022).

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68418.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We use the “supplier specific” and “‘average-data” methods to calculate Category 1 emissions. We gather primary weight data for purchased goods, secondary financial data for services, emission factors and allocate emission data captured directly from suppliers where possible. By spend, 80% of gift suppliers and 100% of packaging suppliers have provided the Group with primary or secondary data. Where weight data is not available, we estimate emissions using other SKUs from the same product category or use an average weight estimate calculated using similar products. For complex products, we use the primary component material of the SKU to calculate emissions. Where suppliers don’t provide emission factors, we obtain them from sources such as WRAP Emissions Factor Database for Scope 3 GHG Measurement & Reporting Database, and UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. For gift experiences, we calculate emissions per experience using internal data. For packaging we track the tonnage of materials used. We also track expenditure on office and IT equipment and average cloud data storage used. We use the “spend-based” method to capture service supplier emissions across the Group.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1570.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category relates to the use of IT equipment, plant and machinery, and fixtures and fittings. Emissions were estimated on spend data per asset category obtained from the fixed asset register.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

153.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions relating to the production of fuels and energy purchased and consumed that are not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Total emissions are determined using the “average-data” method outlined in the GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Industry average Scope 3 emissions factors for each fuel type or natural gas/electricity source are applied to the relevant consumption volumes captured using emissions management software.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1682.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions from upstream transportation and distribution between our suppliers. By spend, we have captured emissions for the top 80% of gift suppliers and 100% of packaging suppliers. We use the distance-based method to calculate total emissions in this category. This method calculates emissions by multiplying internal data on the distance transported, the weight of goods transported and relevant emission factors (average fuel consumption, average utilisation, average vehicle size and associated GHG emissions). We calculate the weight of products and packaging delivered using a weighted average, assuming delivery from a single location per supplier.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions include waste treatment in facilities owned or operated by third parties only. This is categorised as an upstream Scope 3 category as waste management services are purchased by the Group and includes all future emissions that result from waste generated in the year. To calculate emissions, we use the "average-data" method by capturing total waste and disposal methods in our ESG reporting tool, applying average emission factors for each disposal method.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

70.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We apply the distance-based method to calculate flight and car emissions, using data from our internal finance systems and expense claims together with industry average emissions factors from the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting based on the distance travelled. Likewise, for accommodation we have obtained internal data and applied an industry average emission factor.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1304.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We estimate emissions from employee commuting based on the average number of employees and average commuter distances. We also calculate home working emissions considering office equipment and heating per FTE working hour using emissions factors from the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions relate to licensed co-working office space and are calculated based on the number of desks leased, average square footage per desk and average emission factors.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4535.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

To collect Group emissions data, we reach out to suppliers where possible. Many of our supply chain partners provide average emission factors per letter and parcel. In cases where we are unable to obtain primary data, we use emission factors from similar transport and fulfilment suppliers as a proxy. For air freight from our Guernsey factory to the Royal Mail depot on the mainland, we use the "distance based" method to calculate emissions. This method involves multiplying the appropriate emission factor to the mass of the freight and a distance multiplier. While Royal Mail includes the Guernsey-to-mainland UK flight in their overall average emissions per letter, this is an average for all letters delivered (not just for Moonpig). We include this as part of our baseline calculation (given it is a significant element of our downstream transport), whilst acknowledging the possibility of some double counting

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable. The Group does not sell products that require further processing.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

To calculate emissions from our products we use a methodology that multiplies the lifetime number of uses of each product by the quantity sold and an emission factor per use obtained from UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. To estimate the lifetime number of uses and energy usage per hour for each product category, we follow the “average-data” method. We use average specifications for each product category to estimate energy usage per hour, and secondary data for electricity consumed per use to estimate energy usage for electronics. For alcohol usage, we use calculations based on wine, and we exclude indirect emissions from beauty products as they are deemed immaterial.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3055.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

To calculate emissions arising from the disposal of cards, gifts, and packaging we use the “waste-type-specific” method. We obtain weight data for specific product categories from suppliers and internal systems. Average emission factors from the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting and WRAP Emissions Factor Database for Scope 3 GFG Measurement and Reporting Database are used to determine the emissions associated with the proportion of waste treated using various methods. When weight data is unavailable, we estimate this using data from other products within the same category.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

37.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This includes Scope 1 and 2 emissions of the sub-tenant that occupies space on the Group’s head office building. Primary data is obtained from the lessee.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable. The Group does not operate as a franchisor.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

04/30/2022

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The Group only operates a defined contribution pension scheme for its employees. As such, and in accordance with the relevant regulations, we believe it is not appropriate to include this category within our disclosure as the Group does not directly manage or control the investment decisions within the pension plan.
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	*35*	*This includes natural gas consumption from Moonpig, Greetz and Experiences during FY25.*

[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	*495*	*107*	*This includes electricity consumption from Moonpig, Greetz and Experiences during FY25. Market based includes our usage of renewable energy.*

[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

66418

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Hybrid method

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

80

(7.8.5) Please explain

We use the “supplier specific” and “‘average-data” methods to calculate Category 1 emissions. We gather primary weight data for purchased goods, secondary financial data for services, emission factors and allocate emission data captured directly from suppliers where possible. By spend, 80% of gift suppliers and 100% of packaging suppliers have provided the Group with primary or secondary data. Where weight data is not available, we estimate emissions using other SKUs from the same product category or use an average weight estimate calculated using similar products. For complex products, we use the primary component material of the SKU to calculate emissions. Where suppliers don’t provide emission factors, we obtain them from sources such as Sphera GaBi LCA, WRAP Emissions Factor Database for Scope 3 GHG Measurement & Reporting Database, and UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. For gift experiences, we calculate emissions per experience using internal data. For packaging we track the tonnage of materials used. We also track expenditure on office and IT equipment and average cloud data storage used. We use the “spend-based” method to capture service supplier emissions across the Group.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1159

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category relates to the use of IT equipment, plant and machinery, and fixtures and fittings. Emissions are calculated using the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. based on spend data per asset category obtained from the fixed asset register.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

88

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes emissions relating to the production of fuels and energy purchased and consumed that are not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Total emissions are determined using the "average-data" method outlined in the GHG Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard. Industry average Scope 3 emissions factors for each fuel type or natural gas/electricity source are applied to the relevant consumption volumes

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

921

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes emissions from upstream transportation and distribution between our suppliers. By spend, we have captured emissions for the top 80% of gift suppliers and 100% of packaging suppliers. We use the distance-based method to calculate total emissions in this category. This method calculates emissions by multiplying internal data on the distance transported, the weight of goods transported and relevant emission factors (average fuel consumption, average utilisation, average vehicle size and associated GHG emissions). We calculate the weight of products and packaging delivered using a weighted average, assuming delivery from a single location per supplier.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

71

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions include waste treatment in facilities owned or operated by third parties only. This is categorised as an upstream Scope 3 category as waste management services are purchased by the Group and includes all future emissions that result from waste generated in the year. To calculate emissions, we use the "average-data" method by capturing total waste, applying average emission factors for each disposal method.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

130

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

We apply the distance-based method to calculate flight and car emissions, using data from our internal finance systems and expense claims together with industry average emissions factors from the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting based on the distance travelled. Likewise, for accommodation we have obtained internal data and applied an industry average emission factor.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

471

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We estimate emissions from employee commuting using the National Transport and Mobility Statistics for the UK, based on the average number of employees and average commuter distances. For the Netherlands, we calculate employee commuting emissions in accordance with the obligations from the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management. We also calculate homeworking emissions considering office equipment and heating per FTE working hour using emissions factors from the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

12

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Lessor-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 8 emissions relate to licensed co-working office space. Data is obtained from the lessor.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

4892

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

To collect Group emissions data, we reach out to suppliers where possible. Many of our supply chain partners provide average emission factors per letter and parcel. In cases where we are unable to obtain primary data, we use emission factors from similar transport and fulfilment suppliers as a proxy. For air freight from our Guernsey factory to the Royal Mail depot on the mainland, we use the "distance based" method to calculate emissions. This method involves multiplying the appropriate emission factor to the mass of the freight and a distance multiplier. While Royal Mail includes the Guernsey-to-mainland UK flight in their overall average emissions per letter, this is an average for all letters delivered (not just for Moonpig). We include this as part of our baseline calculation (given it is a significant element of our downstream transport), whilst acknowledging the possibility of some double counting

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

18

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

To calculate emissions from our products we use a methodology that multiplies the lifetime number of uses of each product by the quantity sold and an emission factor per use obtained from UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. To estimate the lifetime number of uses and energy usage per hour for each product category, we follow the "average-data" method. We use average specifications for each product category to estimate energy usage per hour, and secondary data for electricity consumed per use to estimate energy usage for electronics. For alcohol usage, we use calculations based on wine, and we exclude indirect emissions from beauty products as they are deemed immaterial.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3090

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average product method

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

To calculate emissions arising from the disposal of cards, gifts, and packaging we use the "waste-type-specific" method. We obtain weight data for specific product categories from suppliers and internal systems. Average emission factors from the UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting and WRAP Emissions Factor Database for Scope 3 GHG Measurement and Reporting Database are used to determine the emissions associated with the proportion of waste treated using various methods. When weight data is unavailable, we estimate this using data from other products within the same category.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

60

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

This includes Scope 1 and 2 emissions of the sub-tenant that occupies space on the Group's head office building. Primary data is obtained from the lessee.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in FY25

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in FY25

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.93

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*This small emission decrease is due to a combination of S1 and S2 variations from 2023/24 to 2024/25. Absolute Scope 1 emissions increased from 31 tCO2e in 2023/24 to 35 tCO2e in 2024/25. Absolute Scope 2 emissions (location-based) reduced from 504 tCO2e in 2023/24 to 495 tCO2e in 2024/25. This was mostly due to efficiency in our plants, supported by the installation of electricity submeters in Tamworth. Therefore, absolute Scope 1+2 emissions reduced by 0.93% (or 5 tCO2e) from 535 tCO2e in 2023/24 to 530 tCO2e in 2024/25. The reduction was calculated according to the formula: ((530-535)/535) * 100 = 0.93% (i.e. 0.93% GHG emission reduction).*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Australia	*0*	*0*	*0*
Ireland	*0*	*0*	*0*
Netherlands	*26*	*268*	*0*
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	*9*	*227*	*107*
United States of America	*0*	*0*	*0*

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By facility

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Moonpig - Herbal House

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

51.52265

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-0.10932

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Greetz - Almere

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

52.37144

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

5.27518
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By facility

(7.20.2) 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)
Row 1	*Moonpig - Tamworth*	*102*	*0*
Row 2	*Moonpig - Herbal House*	*18*	*0*
Row 3	*Greetz - Almere*	*268*	*0*
Row 4	*Moonpig - Guernsey*	*107*	*107*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35

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

495

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

107

(7.22.4) Please explain

These include the total GHG emission generated by Moonpig Group during FY25 as disclosed in detail on the previous questions.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

There are no other entities to be included. All the GHG/ carbon emissions are included as the Moonpig Group consolidated approach.
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Moonpig

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Printing services

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

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7

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

221

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

107

(7.23.1.15) Comment

These emissions (Moonpig) include the majority of the business in the UK + Guernsey.

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Greetz

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Printing services

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

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26

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

268

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

These emissions (Greetz) are equivalent to the ones reported in the NL.

Row 3

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Experiences

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Other professional services

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

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

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

6

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

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

These emissions (Experiences) correspond to a fraction of the emissions in the UK.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

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

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

202

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

202.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1309

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

514

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

1823.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1309

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

716

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

2025.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

202

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Consumption of natural gas for heating (UK & NL).

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

202

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

584

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ REGO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Renewable Energy (electricity) consumed in the UK.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

725

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ GO

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Renewable Energy (electricity) consumed in the NL
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

725

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

725.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1098

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1098.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

1.51

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

530

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

350068000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

3.82

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

(7.45.9) Please explain

In 2023/24 the Scope 1 and 2 Intensity ratio (tCO2e/M of revenue) was 1.57. The numerator (total S1+2) was bigger (535 tCO2e), whereas the denominator was smaller (341.140 M revenue). Therefore, the reason for change during 2024/25 is a mix of emission reduction (numerator) & increased revenue (denominator).
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Moonpig.com Limited - SBTi - Target Setting Letter - Signed v3.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

04/30/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

04/30/2020

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

159

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

518

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

0.000

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

677.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

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

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

04/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

338.500

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

35

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

495

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

530.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

43.43

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We have set a goal to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by at least 50% by 2030, using 2019/20 as the baseline year. The Scope 1 and 2 baseline validated by the SBTi was for Moonpig and Greetz in 2019/20, which has been re-expressed for the acquisition of Experiences.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

In line with the Science Based Target initiative, we aim to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by at least 50% by 2030 (i.e. short term), using 2019/20 as the baseline year.

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

In FY25, our reported Scope 1 emissions were 106 tCO_2e, including a one-off, non-routine refrigerant gas replenishment at our Tamworth HVAC system. Excluding this event, Scope 1 emissions were 35 tCO_2e. Scope 2 emissions, measured on a location-based methodology, were 495 tCO_2e, bringing combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions to 601 tCO_2e, or 530 tCO_2e on a like-for-like basis. Using the market-based approach, which reflects our renewable energy procurement, adjusted Scope 1 and 2 emissions for FY25 were 142 tCO_2e. This reduction reflects continued progress through our planning, which included enhanced energy monitoring (with energy performance system implementation in Tamworth), relocation of our Dutch operations from Amsterdam to Almere to improve efficiency, and ongoing investment in renewable energy procurement, with solar installations planned at our Almere site to be completed during FY26. Looking ahead, we will continue to prioritise energy efficiency, electrification, and the transition away from natural gas to ensure progress towards our SBTi-validated targets of a 50% reduction in operational emissions by 2030 and 90% reduction by 2050.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Moonpig.com Limited - SBTi - Target Setting Letter - Signed v3.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

04/30/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)
☑ Methane (CH_4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

04/30/2020

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

159

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

518

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

0.000

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

677.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

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

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

04/30/2050

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

90

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

67.700

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

35

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

495

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

530.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

24.13

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We have set a goal to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by at least 90% by 2050, using 2019/20 as the baseline year. The Scope 1 and 2 baseline validated by the SBTi was for Moonpig and Greetz in 2019/20, which has been re-expressed for the acquisition of Experiences.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

In line with the Science Based Target initiative, we aim to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by at least 90% by 2050 (i.e. long term), using 2019/20 as the baseline year.

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

In FY25, our reported Scope 1 emissions were 106 tCO_2e, including a one-off, non-routine refrigerant gas replenishment at our Tamworth HVAC system. Excluding this event, Scope 1 emissions were 35 tCO_2e. Scope 2 emissions, measured on a location-based methodology, were 495 tCO_2e, bringing combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions to 601 tCO_2e, or 530 tCO_2e on a like-for-like basis. Using the market-based approach, which reflects our renewable energy procurement, adjusted Scope 1 and 2 emissions for FY25 were 142 tCO_2e. This reduction reflects continued progress through our planning, which included enhanced energy monitoring (with energy performance system implementation in Tamworth), relocation of our Dutch operations from Amsterdam to Almere to improve efficiency, and ongoing investment in renewable energy procurement, with solar installations planned at our Almere site to be completed during FY26. Looking ahead, we will continue to prioritise energy efficiency, electrification, and the transition away from natural gas to ensure progress towards our SBTi-validated targets of a 50% reduction in operational emissions by 2030 and 90% reduction by 2050.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

04/30/2022

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

☑ Abs2

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

04/30/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and we have committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative in the next two years

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Apart from targets on Scope 1&2 (already covered in question 7.53.1), the Group also has set a short and a long-term goal to reduce our Scope 3 emissions, using 2021/22 (iFY22) as the baseline. Efforts to engage key suppliers to reduce their emissions during FY25 are expected to contribute to reductions in the future. All applicable Scope 3 categories (i.e. the ones calculated by the Group) are included, with some of them being of higher relevance (e.g. Purchased Goods and Services).

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Short term: the Group has set a goal to obtain commitment from suppliers representing 67% of Scope 3 emissions in setting net zero emissions reduction targets aligned with SBTi criteria by 2030. As of 30 April 2025, the Group had obtained SBTi-aligned commitment from suppliers covering 28.8% of our Scope 3 emissions. Long term: reduce Scope 3 emissions intensity by 97% tCO2e/ 1m of revenue by 2050, using FY22 as the baseline.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

Short term: the Group has set a goal to obtain commitment from suppliers representing 67% of Scope 3 emissions in setting net zero emissions reduction targets aligned with SBTi criteria by 30 April 2030. Investments have been made in systems and resources to support the goal achievement.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

The Scope 3 goal, aligned with the latest Net Zero recommendations, is tracked annually and embedded within our Sustainability Strategy, which was revised in FY25. It falls under the Climate Change pillar (Goal 2 – Net Zero value chain emissions). Moonpig is also monitoring the draft Corporate Net-Zero Standard V2 currently under consultation and will consider the suggested changes once the final guidance is provided, adapting our approach as needed.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*27*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*1*	*5*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Smart control system

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

10

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

500

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1500

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Installation of Submeters in Tamworth. Estimated to save/ reduce around 10% of energy consumption. Currently impacts mostly on Location-based Scope 2 emissions (whereas Market-based remains the same due to renewable energy purchase).
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

A Sustainability Working Group meets regularly throughout the year to coordinate climate related planning, delivery against those plans and climate-related disclosure, which can also include employee engagement whenever applicable. The Sustainability Working Group comprises the CFO and COO together with individuals in Finance and Sustainability roles. These elements discuss potential investments in emission reduction activities.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Emission related criteria are included in remuneration targets of senior leadership. Internal teams implementing initiatives are celebrated through Sustainability Group showcase calls. Teams are also incentivised to support the development of sustainability actions, with previous cases of different roles being involved in business cases to support adoption of better waste treatment or implementation of additional solar panels.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☑ Mixed renewables

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Moonpig Group purchased a variety of carbon credits from different projects. For example, one of the projects reduces emissions by an average of 80,930 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year in an Asian country. Clean electricity from this project displaces electricity that would otherwise be generated by burning fossil fuels. Carbon finance provides essential funds to support the development of renewable energy projects like this. The proposed project installs 33 sets of wind turbines with each rated capability of 1.5MW. The total installed capacity is 49.5MW. The corresponding net power supplied to the grid is estimated to be 90,288MWh annually.

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

495

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☑ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☑ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☑ CDM (Clean Development Mechanism)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☑ Standardized Approaches

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☑ No risk of reversal

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☑ Not assessed

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

The project is designed to minimize negative environmental impacts by replacing carbon-intensive energy with renewables and adhering to strict environmental safeguards. Economically, it fosters local employment and growth, ensuring equitable benefits for surrounding communities. Socially, the project engages with local stakeholders to mitigate adverse effects, improve access to clean energy, and protect vulnerable populations.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

The Group offsets its Scope 1 and 2 emissions from the previous year by investing through a supplier which obtains independent verification from a recognised accreditation body for each project that it works with.
[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water withdrawals are measured through direct monitoring (water bills) or via estimation from a hydrological model (e.g. average office consumption per FTE).

(9.2.4) Please explain

Whenever possible, Moonpig Group collects water data from direct sources (e.g. water consumption meters from water providers). When this is not available, an estimation is performed. The Group is constantly looking for better ways to collect and manage water data.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group only utilises water from third party providers who are responsible for water quality. No other sources are used.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group only utilises water from third party providers who are responsible for water quality, with high standards in the countries where the Group operates (UK and NL).

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge is an estimate from water withdrawals, with the assumption that 100% of water is consumed (i.e. zero discharge).

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption (i.e. there is no discharge).

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge by destination.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge by treatment method.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge by standard quality parameters.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge by additional quality parameters,

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge by temperature.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water consumption is an estimate from water withdrawals, with the assumption that 100% of water is consumed (i.e. zero discharge).

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption (i.e. there is no discharge).

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no water recycled/ reused.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Moonpig Group ensures that all its operational sites provide fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services. These services are regularly measured and monitored through facilities inspections and employee feedback.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Moonpig Group is committed to providing all workers with safe and well-maintained WASH (water, sanitation, and hygiene) services across its operations. These services are essential to employee well-being, particularly in production and fulfilment centres where physical activity may increase the need for high hygiene standards. Although the Group's overall water use is relatively low due to its digital-first business model, we place strong emphasis on water quality and sanitation in our facilities. In our fulfilment centres, water is mainly used for hygiene, employee welfare, and limited operational needs. We follow industry best practices to ensure all workers have reliable access to clean water, safe sanitation, and hygiene facilities, supporting both a healthy and productive workplace.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

6571

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

During FY2025 the Group had an increase in water consumption compared to the previous year. This was primarily driven by (i) a change in methodology, with more accurate data collected and fewer estimates used, and (ii) additional water use at our Tamworth fulfilment centre related to sprinkler system and water tank testing. In the same period, the closure of our Amsterdam office was completed, with operations fully reallocated to Almere. Looking ahead, we expect water consumption volumes to remain broadly consistent with FY25 levels, reflecting our operational profile and business activity. As previously stated, the Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

During FY2025 the Group had an increase in water consumption compared to the previous year. This was primarily driven by (i) a change in methodology, with more accurate data collected and fewer estimates used, and (ii) additional water use at our Tamworth fulfilment centre related to sprinkler system and water tank testing. In the same period, the closure of our Amsterdam office was completed, with operations fully reallocated to Almere. Looking ahead, we expect water consumption volumes to remain broadly consistent with FY25 levels, reflecting our operational profile and business activity. As previously stated, the Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

6571

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

During FY2025 the Group had an increase in water consumption compared to the previous year. This was primarily driven by (i) a change in methodology, with more accurate data collected and fewer estimates used, and (ii) additional water use at our Tamworth fulfilment centre related to sprinkler system and water tank testing. In the same period, the closure of our Amsterdam office was completed, with operations fully reallocated to Almere. Looking ahead, we expect water consumption volumes to remain broadly consistent with FY25 levels, reflecting our operational profile and business activity. As previously stated, the Group assumes that 100% of water volumes are used for consumption. Therefore, there is no discharge.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Moonpig Group only consumes water from the UK and Netherlands. According to the WRI Aqueduct (Country Rankings), both countries are considered under low-medium water stress.
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.4) Please explain

Moonpig's direct operations have minimal water usage, with volumes comparable to standard office consumption and posing no major risk in the medium to long term. Our Double Materiality Assessment, completed in FY25, identified water as a non-material topic for the business. Nevertheless, we continue to track our water consumption and, should future assessments indicate greater relevance, we will explore this topic further.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.4) Please explain

Moonpig's direct operations have minimal water consumption. As part of our Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) completed in FY25, water was deemed a non-material topic for the Group. We recognise our value chain requires higher water usage, mostly in the paper/packaging and flower sectors. Our paper supplier sources 100% from non-water-stressed areas, and our main packaging supplier reports less than 10% of sourcing, and only 3% of total intake, from water-stressed regions. Flowers are sourced mostly from counties classified as low water-stress. While risks are currently limited, we continue working with suppliers to promote sustainable practices, such as adopting dry-packed flowers, and remain prepared to explore water impacts further should they become more material in the future.
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

350068000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

53274.69

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

For CDP disclosure, this is calculated as total revenue per total water withdrawal volume in the reporting period. The Group expects to grow in revenue, whilst consuming less water. Therefore, the overall expectancy for future years is to have higher water withdrawal efficiency.
[Fixed row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XIV of UK REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ 41-60

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Within the Moonpig Group facilities there is usage of inks, varnishes and imaging oil. These substances, although consumed in a very small amount, are used in the printing of our cards. Therefore, we've included the revenue range associated with them. On an ongoing basis, the Group reviews the market for better and more sustainable printing technology options.

[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

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

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.14.4) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not classify any of its current products or services as low water impact because water usage, while important, is not an immediate strategic priority for the business. The company's primary focus is on other environmental issues, such as carbon emissions and packaging. While water is relevant in certain parts of the supply chain, like flower production, Moonpig's direct operations and core products involve minimal water usage.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

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

(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?

(9.15.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

Moonpig Group’s direct operations have minimal water usage, given our primarily digital business model and lean fulfilment/printing processes. Our FY25 Double Materiality Assessment identified water as a non-material topic for the Group, and as such we have not set specific water-related targets. We continue to track our operational water consumption and will reassess its relevance over time. If future assessments indicate that water becomes more material, we will consider developing goals, targets, or policies as appropriate.
[Fixed row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Plastic packaging

☑ Eliminate single-use plastic packaging

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

☑ Ensure compliance with EPR policies and schemes

(10.1.3) Please explain

The Group is committed to phasing out single-use plastic through our own operations and throughout its value chain. Shipping packaging made of single-used plastics have been completely removed from the Group's operations in the UK during FY24 and in the Netherlands during FY25. In addition, we focus on ensuring compliance with Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) regulations, particularly in our key markets of the UK and the Netherlands. This includes monitoring and reducing the use of plastic packaging, as well as reporting on the environmental impacts of any plastic materials we use. As part of our new Sustainability Strategy, we have introduced a dedicated goal on Circularity, which prioritises reducing the overall amount of packaging used in our products and operations. This includes aligning with EPR requirements, driving packaging reduction initiatives, and embedding circular design principles across our value chain to help mitigate environmental impacts and contribute to a more sustainable future.

[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not produce nor commercialise raw plastic polymers or plastic converters.

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not produce any type of durable plastic goods and/ or components. However, the Group resells/ commercializes a range of gifts that may include durable plastic components.

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

The Group operations do not focus on the usage of durable plastic goods or components directly.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not produce any type of plastic packaging. However, during peak time plastic wraps can be used. These volumes are minimal and have reduced year over year within our operations.

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not produce any type of goods/ products packaged in plastic. However, the Group resells/ commercializes some gifts that may include plastic wraps (such as chocolates).

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig's business model focuses on online retail, and it does not provide services like food services that rely heavily on plastic packaging.

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig Group is not involved in waste or water management services.

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not offer financial products or services, nor is it involved in financing plastics-related activities.

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

(10.2.2) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(10.4) Provide the total weight of plastic durable goods and durable components produced, sold and/or used, and indicate the raw material content.

Durable goods and durable components sold

(10.4.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

15.95

(10.4.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ None

(10.4.7) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not produce any type of durable plastic goods and/ or components. However, the Group resells/ commercializes gifts that may include durable plastic components (e.g. reusable plastic bricks).
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

Plastic packaging sold

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

0

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ None

(10.5.7) Please explain

Moonpig Group does not sell plastic packaging directly. There is ongoing effort to track packaging for the gifts we resell, which shall be able to collect over the next few years.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1) Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)

9.84

(10.5.2) Raw material content percentages available to report

Select all that apply

☑ None

(10.5.7) Please explain

Moonpig Group has used a small amount of plastic (mostly for pallet wrap) during Calendar Year 2024, as well as flower wrap (branded as Moonpig) as requested per EPR controls.
[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

Plastic packaging sold

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply

☑ None

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

Moonpig Group, acting as a reseller, does not control the reusability or recyclability of packaging. However, efforts have been made to comply with Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) regulations, which aim to track and reduce the environmental impact of plastic. Moonpig actively monitors its own plastic usage and has phased out single-use shipping plastic from its own operations in the UK in FY24 and in the Netherlands during FY25, demonstrating a commitment to reducing plastic waste.

Plastic packaging used

(10.5.1.1) Percentages available to report for circularity potential

Select all that apply

☑ % technically recyclable

(10.5.1.3) % of plastic packaging that is technically recyclable

100

(10.5.1.5) Please explain

Moonpig actively monitors its own plastic usage. As part of our new Sustainability Strategy, we have introduced a dedicated goal on Circularity, which prioritises reducing the overall amount of packaging used in our products and operations. This includes continuing our efforts to phase out single-use plastics, aligning with EPR requirements, driving packaging reduction initiatives, and embedding circular design principles across our value chain to help mitigate environmental impacts and contribute to a more sustainable future.
[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

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

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not have activities located in or near areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year. Our operations are primarily centred around digital services and the production of greeting cards, which do not have a direct proximity to ecologically sensitive or high-biodiversity areas.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not have activities located in or near areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year. Our operations are primarily centred around digital services and the production of greeting cards, which do not have a direct proximity to ecologically sensitive or high-biodiversity areas.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not have activities located in or near areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year. Our operations are primarily centred around digital services and the production of greeting cards, which do not have a direct proximity to ecologically sensitive or high-biodiversity areas.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not have activities located in or near areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year. Our operations are primarily centred around digital services and the production of greeting cards, which do not have a direct proximity to ecologically sensitive or high-biodiversity areas.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not have activities located in or near areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year. Our operations are primarily centred around digital services and the production of greeting cards, which do not have a direct proximity to ecologically sensitive or high-biodiversity areas.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Moonpig Group does not have activities located in or near areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year. Our operations are primarily centred around digital services and the production of greeting cards, which do not have a direct proximity to ecologically sensitive or high-biodiversity areas.
[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

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

☑ Identification, assessment, and management processes

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

☑ Other climate change verification standard, please specify :The requirements of the Companies Act 2006

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

As part of their external audit, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) makes enquiries of management to understand the extent of the potential impact of climate risk on the Group’s financial statements.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

moonpig-group-plc-annual-report-2025-full-version.pdf
[Add row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information
	N/A

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Financial Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:
☑ No