Caesars Entertainment - Water Security 2021

W0. Introduction

W0.1

(W0.1) Give a general description of and introduction to your organization.

Caesars Entertainment, Inc. (NASDAQ: CZR) is the largest casino-entertainment company in the US and one of the world's most diversified casino-entertainment providers. Since its beginning in Reno, NV, in 1937, Caesars Entertainment, Inc. has grown through development of new resorts, expansions and acquisitions. Caesars Entertainment, Inc.'s resorts operate primarily under the Caesars®, Harrah's®, Horseshoe®, and Eldorado® brand names. Caesars Entertainment, Inc. offers diversified gaming, entertainment and hospitality amenities, one-of-a-kind destinations, and a full suite of mobile and online gaming and sports betting experiences. All tied to its industry-leading Caesars Rewards loyalty program, the company focuses on building value with its guests through a unique combination of impeccable service, operational excellence and technology leadership. Caesars is committed to being a responsible corporate citizen and environmental steward through our CSR strategy, PEOPLE PLANET PLAY. This is reflected in our Code of Commitment which is our public pledge to our guests, Team Members, communities, business partners and all those we reach that we will honor the trust they have placed in us through ethical conduct and integrity. We commit to: PEOPLE: Supporting the wellbeing of our Team Members, guests and local communities.; PLANET: Taking care of the world we all call home; PLAY: Creating memorable experiences for our guests and leading responsible gaming practices in the industry. All data contained here within reflects the combined operations of Caesars Entertainment Inc. and Eldorado Resorts Inc., hereto referred to as Caesars Entertainment.

W0.2

(W0.2) State the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

	Start date	End date
Reporting year	January 1 2020	December 31 2020

W0.3

(W0.3) Select the countries/areas for which you will be supplying data.

Canada
Egypt
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America

W0.4

(W0.4) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

USD

W0.5

(W0.5) Select the option that best describes the reporting boundary for companies, entities, or groups for which water impacts on your business are being reported.

Companies, entities or groups over which operational control is exercised

W0.6

(W0.6) Within this boundary, are there any geographies, facilities, water aspects, or other exclusions from your disclosure?

No

W1. Current state

W1.1

(W1.1) Rate the importance (current and future) of water quality and water quantity to the success of your business.

	Direct use importance rating	Indirect use importance rating	Please explain
Sufficient amounts of good quality freshwater available for use	Vital	Important	Direct: Over 95% of our water is purchased from local utilities. The availability of sufficient amounts of good quality freshwater is vital to our business to provide WASH facilities to our guests and employees and allows our facilities to remain open. We anticipate future water dependency to decrease in our direct operations as we continue to make progress towards our 2025 water reduction target through the implementation of conservation and efficiency projects, including the use of reclamation technology. Indirect: Our resort properties are large consumers of food, such as produce. Freshwater supply for farmers to grow and supply crops is important to our business. A decrease in food supply has the potential to substantively impact the operation of our kitchens and restaurants. Future indirect water dependency will decrease as our suppliers become more water efficient.
Sufficient amounts of recycled, brackish and/or produced water available for use	Not very important	Important	Direct use: Caesars doesn't use water sourced from recycled, brackish, and/or produced water and we don't plan to in the future. For this reason, access to recycled, brackish and/or produced water is not considered very important to our direct operations and we do not foresee future water dependency differing in the future. Indirect use: Recycled water supply can impact the availability of our sourced goods, and our ability to source quality produce is important to our business. Future indirect recycled, brackish and/or produced water dependency will remain flat overtime as no significant change in operations is anticipated.

W1.2

(W1.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

	% of sites/facilities/operations	Please explain
Water withdrawals – total volumes	100%	100% of water withdrawal volume is monitored by local meters for each of our facilities. Volumes are read/measured monthly for all sites. Total water withdrawal volume is tracked over time with a utility data management solution that manages data collection, capture, audit and analysis, and global business reporting from a single system of record.
Water withdrawals – volumes by source	100%	100% of water purchase and well water use volume is monitored by local meters for each of our facilities. Volumes are read/measured monthly for all sites. Total water withdrawal volume is tracked over time with a utility data management solution that manages data collection, capture, audit and analysis, and global business reporting from a single system of record.
Entrained water associated with your metals & mining sector activities - total volumes [only metals and mining sector]	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Produced water associated with your oil & gas sector activities - total volumes [only oil and gas sector]	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Water withdrawals quality	76-99	Water withdrawal quality is monitored through monitoring equipment installed in our central plant facilities. Water quality is monitored 24-7 to adjust water withdrawal volume, chemical levels and other water treatment aspects.
Water discharges – total volumes	76-99	Monitoring equipment is used to continually measure total water discharge volume at most of our facilities. It is not feasible to measure discharges at certain hotel locations. All facilities monitor their discharge of cooling water 24-7 with installed monitoring equipment, which is one of our highest water use categories. Most of our water is used by our guests and returned to the sewer system (estimated at 85% return rate).
Water discharges – volumes by destination	76-99	Total water discharge volume by destination is monitored at most of our facilities. Sewer discharge is returned to the sewer system and treated at local treatment facilities. All facilities monitor their discharge of cooling water 24-7 with installed monitoring equipment, which is one of our highest water use categories. Most of our water is used by guests and returned to the sewer system. It is not feasible to measure discharges at all locations. However, we estimate over 85% of our water usage is discharged to the sewer system. This level of monitoring is appropriate for our business type.
Water discharges – volumes by treatment method	76-99	Total water discharge volume by destination is monitored at most of our facilities. Sewer discharge is returned to the sewer system and treated at local treatment facilities. All facilities monitor their discharge of cooling water 24-7 with installed monitoring equipment, which is one of our highest water use categories. Most of our water is used by guests and returned to the sewer system. It is not feasible to measure discharges at all locations. However, we estimate over 85% of our water usage is discharged to the sewer system. This level of monitoring is appropriate for our business type.
Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters	Not relevant	The regular monitoring and measurement of water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters is not relevant as all discharged water flows to the local municipalities and is managed/treated by those municipalities. Water discharge quality by standard effluent paraments is not expected to be relevant in the future.
Water discharge quality – temperature	Not relevant	The regular monitoring and measurement of water discharge quality by temperature is not relevant as all discharged water flows to the local municipalities and is managed/treated by those municipalities. The temperature of our discharged water is irrelevant. This water aspect is not expected to be relevant in the future.
Water consumption – total volume	76-99	We estimate that less than 15% of our water usage is consumed by customers or used for irrigation. The majority of our water is used on site either as process water or by our guests and employees and returned directly to the sewer system. We directly monitor (24-7) the majority of our water discharge, which goes directly into the sewer system to water treatment facilities. This level of monitoring is appropriate for our business type.
Water recycled/reused	76-99	Water is re-used in our building cooling cycle to the extent it can reasonably be recycled through cooling towers. The quantity is monitored through monitoring equipment and meters installed in our central plant facilities. Water recycling is monitored 24-7 to adjust water blowdown volume in order to maintain proper chemical levels and other water treatment aspects and to minimize water use.
The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers	100%	All facilities provide WASH services for 100% of our employees. This is monitored and reported on at least monthly through audits.

W1.2b

(W1.2b) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, and how do these volumes compare to the previous reporting year?

	Volume (megaliters/year)	Comparison with previous reporting year	Please explain
Total withdrawals	10788	Lower	In 2020, Caesars portfolio changed due to the merger Overall, water withdrawals decreased compared to the previous year, with a 21.6% decrease. Most of that decrease was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to our focused efforts on reducing water consumption, our YoY portfolio-wide water intensity decreased from 62.78 kgal per 1,000 sq. ft. to 40.94 kgal per 1,000 sq. ft. We anticipate 2021 volumes to rise as the COVID-19 restrictions ease, however, long-term future volumes are expected to decrease as we continue to invest in efficiency projects to reduce water consumption. Withdrawals = Discharge + Consumption: 10,788 ML = 9,170 ML + 1,618 ML
Total discharges	9170	Lower	We estimate our discharge to be 85% of our total municipal and well water use. The majority of the water used in our facilities is used by guests, employees, or in cooling applications and is returned to the sewer. Discharge decreased compared to the previous year, with a 21.6% decrease, in line with total withdrawal. Most of that decrease was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Future water discharge volumes for 2021 will likely increase as the COVID-19 impacts subside, however, we anticipate long-term volumes to decrease or vary in line with total withdrawal, as we invest in efficiency projects to reduce water consumption.
Total consumption	1618	Lower	We calculate consumption to be withdrawals minus discharges. This includes evaporation from pools and cooling systems and on-site usage from guests. Consumption decreased compared to the previous year, with a 21.6% decrease, in line with total withdrawal and discharge. Most of that decrease was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Future water consumption will decrease as we progress towards our 2025 goal of a 25% reduction in water usage per square foot against a 2008 baseline. Future water consumption volumes for 2021 will likely increase as the COVID-19 impacts subside, however, we anticipate long-term volumes to decrease or vary in line with total withdrawal, as we invest in efficiency projects to reduce water consumption.

W1.2d

(W1.2d) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress and provide the proportion.

	Withdrawals are from areas with water stress	% withdrawn from areas with water stress	Comparison with previous reporting year	Identification tool	Please explain
Row 1	Yes	26-50	Lower	WRI Aqueduct	Caesars selected to use WRI's Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas (Aqueduct 3.0), a credible, publicly available methodology for assessing levels of water stress, as an identification tool to determine what percentage of our annual water withdrawals are from a 'stressed area'. We supplied data based on the location of Caesars facilities. Caesars identified 26 of our facilities that withdraw from 7 different river basins in areas where "Baseline Water Stress" (as defined by WRI) is equal to or greater than medium-high: 20-40%. We have identified an additional 15 of our facilities that withdrawal from 2 different river basins where water depletion is (as defined by WRI) equal to or greater than 75% on an inter-annual timescale. A total of 6 facilities both meet or exceed the 40% threshold and have water depletion equal to or greater than 75% on an inter-annual timescale. In accordance with these indicators and thresholds for defining an area as 'water stressed' for the purposes of disclosure to CDP, 26 of our facilities withdraw water from 'stressed areas'. The sum of total water withdrawals for these 26 facilities is used to determine the total volume withdrawn by Caesars in stressed areas. In comparison with the previous reporting year, the sum of total water withdrawals from stressed areas is 75% lower and the proportion of total withdrawals sourced from water stressed areas is 62% lower. Caesars measured a YOY decrease in total water withdrawals at 22 of the 26 facilities that withdraw from water stressed areas. This decrease is a result of the water efficiency and conservation projects that we are implementing as a part of our CodeGreen sustainability strategy. Additional decrease was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

W1.2h

(W1.2h) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

	Relevance	Volume (megaliters/year)	Comparison with previous reporting year	Please explain
Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes is not relevant as all water withdrawals are from renewable groundwater sources or third-party municipal sources.
Brackish surface water/Seawater	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Brackish surface water/Seawater is not relevant as all water withdrawals are from renewable groundwater sources or third-party municipal sources.
Groundwater – renewable	Relevant	281	Lower	This is relevant as several Caesars facilities utilize wells from renewable groundwater sources. The total volume is lower than prior year, a result of the water efficiency and conservation projects have been implemented as a part of our CodeGreen sustainability strategy. Additional decrease in 2020 was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
Groundwater – non-renewable	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Groundwater – non-renewable is not relevant as all water withdrawals are from renewable groundwater sources or third-party municipal sources.
Produced/Entrained water	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Produced/Entrained water is not relevant as all water withdrawals are from renewable groundwater sources or third-party municipal sources.
Third party sources	Relevant	10507	Lower	This is relevant as the majority of Caesars facilities utilize water from third-party municipal sources. The total volume is lower than prior year, a result of the water efficiency and conservation projects have been implemented as a part of our CodeGreen sustainability strategy. Additional decrease in 2020 was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

W1.2i

(W1.2i) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

	Relevance	Volume (megaliters/year)	Comparison with previous reporting year	Please explain
Fresh surface water	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Surface water discharge is not relevant as all discharges are made to third-party destinations.
Brackish surface water/seawater	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Brackish water is not relevant as all discharges are made to third-party destinations.
Groundwater	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Groundwater is not relevant as all discharges are made to third-party destinations.
Third-party destinations	Relevant	9170	Lower	Third-party destinations are relevant as all facilities discharge to sewers. This number is lower than prior year, a result of the water efficiency and conservation projects have been implemented as a part of our CodeGreen sustainability strategy. Additional decrease in 2020 was attributed to water reduction efforts made during temporary property closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

W1.2j

(W1.2j) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

	Relevance of treatment level to discharge	Volume (megaliters/year)	Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year	% of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to	Please explain
Tertiary treatment	Relevant	917	This is our first year of measurement	1-10	A small portion of Caesars sites treat water discharge on site. However, the majority of discharges are made directly to the sewer system for offsite treatment. We estimate this volume at 10% of our discharges.
Secondary treatment	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Caesars does not perform this treatment.
Primary treatment only	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Caesars does not perform this treatment.
Discharge to the natural environment without treatment	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	Caesars does not discharge to the natural environment.
Discharge to a third party without treatment	Relevant	8253	This is our first year of measurement	81-90	A small portion of Caesars sites treat water discharge on site. However, the majority of discharges are made directly to the sewer system for offsite treatment. We estimate this volume at 90% of our discharges.
Other	Not relevant	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	No other discharges.

W1.4

(W1.4) Do you engage with your value chain on water-related issues?

Yes, our suppliers

Yes, our customers or other value chain partners

W1.4a

(W1.4a) What proportion of suppliers do you request to report on their water use, risks and/or management information and what proportion of your procurement spend does this represent?

Row 1

% of suppliers by number

51-75

% of total procurement spend

51-75

Rationale for this coverage

We analyzed our suppliers that have meaningful emissions and therefore, due to the water energy nexus, meaningful water usage, and identified 165 key suppliers. These suppliers make up ~60% of our spend and represent most of our indirect water usage; the other spend is low water intensity regulatory/legal spend. We request suppliers to respond to the CDP Supply Chain module annually. Much of our supplier climate change feedback provides water-related risk information. For example, suppliers and other value chain partners showing emissions and/or energy reductions often correlate directly and indirectly to water reductions. The information provided in supplier responses (and indirectly from our other value chain partners) is used to maintain accountability within our supply chain. We incentivize suppliers to report by giving them preference during RFPs. As we progress towards our Scope 3 target year, we will decrease spend with suppliers who do not report or commit to set SBTs.

Impact of the engagement and measures of success

We request suppliers to respond annually to CDP Supply Chain. Info requested: company environmental programs, targets & risk management. This information is used internally to maintain a pulse on supplier environmental reduction goals and demonstration of progress towards goals. We engage suppliers on how to disclose to CDP (including webinars) and through direct outreach to suppliers who don't respond. Direct outreach includes reference to our Scope 3 target, its importance, and guides suppliers to CDP resources on measuring environmental impacts. If a supplier is not fully engaged, we indicate that we care most about their response to these frameworks, their participation in CDP, and our total engagement strategy. These results are used during supplier selection processes & suppliers with high performance are given preferences in future RFPs. Success of supplier reporting is measured by the number of suppliers who respond to CDP. In 2020, 98 suppliers or 59% responded. This metric is tracked annually; we have seen increases in supplier responses over time, however 2020 saw a slight decrease, which we attribute to the COVID pandemic.

Comment

W1.4b

(W1.4b) Provide details of any other water-related supplier engagement activity.

Type of engagement
Incentivizing for improved water management and stewardship

Details of engagement
Demonstrable progress against water-related targets is incentivized in your supplier relationship management
Water management and stewardship action is integrated into your supplier evaluation
Offer financial incentives to suppliers improving water management and stewardship across their own operations and supply chain

% of suppliers by number
51-75

% of total procurement spend
51-75

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
Caesars recognizes the energy-water nexus: setting SBTs to reduce emissions will lead to reduced water consumption. We analyzed our external expenditures that have meaningful emissions and identified 165 key suppliers that represent our purchased goods category, which includes meat, produce, utilities, etc. These suppliers make up approximately 60% of our expenditures and represent most of our indirect water usage; almost all other spend is regulatory or legal spend, which is low emission and very low water intensity. We elected to engage with key suppliers by encouraging them to set their own SBTs: in 2017, Caesars set a supplier SBT. This level of engagement allows us to have improved visibility into how our suppliers plan to manage risk and resources into the future. When suppliers set SBTs, they are also required to document plans to meet these targets. Suppliers with approved targets are less prone to regulation penalties and they help to mitigate future cost and risk to Caesars.

Impact of the engagement and measures of success
As an outcome of this engagement activity (encouraging/incentivizing suppliers to set SBTs) we have seen more responsible water management /stewardship from suppliers. This trend is assuring/beneficial, as our suppliers are indirectly build water resilience. Suppliers with approved SBTs are less prone to regulation penalties and mitigate future cost/risk as they are proactive in addressing water use. By mitigating future costs due to climate change/regulations, we can indirectly realize reduced costs of supplies (e.g., future produce costs affected by climate change induced drought or water regulations). By engaging with suppliers to decrease their dependency on freshwater, we can mitigate supplier risks & water supply/cost risks. Engagement is measured by how many key suppliers have approved SBTs and selected as it is easy to track. In 2020, 22/165 suppliers set SBTs and 13 suppliers had either submitted SBTs for approval or anticipate setting SBTs within 2 years. Our goal is to have 60% of key suppliers set SBTs by 2023.

Comment

W1.4c

(W1.4c) What is your organization's rationale and strategy for prioritizing engagements with customers or other partners in its value chain?

We prioritize engagements with employees, customers, & investors as part of CodeGreen (CG) to assess & reduce risk, reduce usage, & encourage environmental stewardship & innovation. Engaging with these partners on water issues is relevant because our activity is affected by water issues outside of our supply chain. Investor engagement is key to our risk management & goal-setting processes, which is a growing concern from this group. Engagement with our 54,000 employees through extensive CG awareness & training programs is considered a priority since our employees are the engine behind the success of CG of which a large part is water conservation. Engagement with our customers is vital to our success as water use from guests make up a significant portion of our usage. We encourage conservation behaviors through signage & promote actions (e.g., linen reuse), & conduct monthly audits to monitor efforts. Investor engagement includes participation in CDP, CSR & other reports (10-K). The success of employee engagement is measured through goal progress & completion of our training programs. Survey results are shared through a CG Scorecard, which is available for all sites to view performance on six key metrics, including employee engagement & progress towards water goals. Customer engagement is measured through weekly Customer Surveys & participation in on-site programs (e.g., Laundry OpEx). For 2020, the laundry OpEx was still in place through March & for most of the rest of the year, housekeeping services were paused for any occupied rooms due health risks which made the OpEx compliance rate reach a 100%. The OpEx program will evolve in 2021 with the ease of restrictions around COVID to include laundry operations & other areas. Investor success is measured through our company scores on annual reports (such as CDP) & through investor active participation in quarterly shareholder calls, more specifically, their questions about water use, risk & management.

W2. Business impacts

W2.1

(W2.1) Has your organization experienced any detrimental water-related impacts?
Yes

W2.1a

(W2.1a) Describe the water-related detrimental impacts experienced by your organization, your response, and the total financial impact.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (Calcasieu River (feeds Calcasieu Lake and Gulf of Mexico))

Type of impact driver & Primary impact driver

Physical	Flooding

Primary impact
Closure of operations

Description of impact
In 2020, our Lake Charles property in Louisiana was forced to close on August 27th due to extreme and irreparable damage and flooding from Hurricane Laura. The property will remain closed through at least summer 2022 as a new land-based casino hotel is constructed, at a cost of over $120 million. Since the closure, nearly $100M in losses has occurred (not including the $122M in capital to move the property to land). However, $44M was received in insurance receivables. Our company-wide substantive impact threshold is $50k which this event exceeded. Both the extended closure and the re-sitting of the facility on land are considered substantive financial impacts.

Primary response
Re-site facilities

Total financial impact
178000000

Description of response
Primary response to the 2020 damage and flooding at the Lake Charles property in Louisiana was to re-sit the barge casino onto land and sell the barge. This will be a multi-year process in which construction of the new facility began in 2020 and should be completed in 2022. The new facility provides improved resilience and is better protected against the frequency, duration, and remediation costs of future floods and hurricanes. Future flood concerns were incorporated into the decision to move the site. Caesars has developed updated flood plans and ensured compliance. Climate Risk Assessment identified that even after relocation, the property will still face extreme weather and flood risks. Additionally, over 20 sites are enrolled in the National Flood Insurance Program. The total financial impact of $178M associated with the hurricane is derived by summing the project cost for re-sitting, lost revenue from the extended closure ($100M and counting), and costs related to displaced employees, emergency response, electrical infrastructure, increased insurance requirements, and corrections to flood and hurricane damage.

W2.2

(W2.2) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?
No

W3. Procedures

W3.3

(W3.3) Does your organization undertake a water-related risk assessment?
Yes, water-related risks are assessed

W3.3a

(W3.3a) Select the options that best describe your procedures for identifying and assessing water-related risks.

Direct operations

Coverage
Full

Risk assessment procedure
Water risks are assessed as a standalone issue

Frequency of assessment
More than once a year

How far into the future are risks considered?
More than 6 years

Type of tools and methods used
Tools on the market
Databases
Other

Tools and methods used
Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer
WRI Aqueduct
Internal company methods
External consultants

Comment

Supply chain

Coverage
Full

Risk assessment procedure
Water risks are assessed as a standalone issue

Frequency of assessment
More than once a year

How far into the future are risks considered?
More than 6 years

Type of tools and methods used
Tools on the market
Databases
Other

Tools and methods used
Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer
WRI Aqueduct
Internal company methods
External consultants

Comment

Other stages of the value chain

Coverage
Partial

Risk assessment procedure
Water risks are assessed as a standalone issue

Frequency of assessment
More than once a year

How far into the future are risks considered?
More than 6 years

Type of tools and methods used
Tools on the market
Databases
Other

Tools and methods used
Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer
WRI Aqueduct
Internal company methods
External consultants

Comment

W3.3b

(W3.3b) Which of the following contextual issues are considered in your organization's water-related risk assessments?

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Water availability at a basin/catchment level	Relevant, always included	Water availability at a basin/catchment level is considered a highly relevant contextual issue, fundamental to the continuity of our business operation. We use water for guest and WASH services and in operation of critical building systems. Water availability is, therefore, factored into our risk assessment throughout the organization. We evaluate water availability parameters for the main aquifers impacted by our operations and value chain. We use information gathered by our Enterprise Risk Management, Sustainable Operations, and Facilities & Engineering teams, along with using the WRI's Aqueduct tool to complete our water risk assessment. Water availability parameters are monitored closely by our Sustainable Operations function. Caesars is also closely monitoring external factors impacting water availability, including regulations and potential, intense droughts. For example, the WRI Aqueduct tool was used and predicted the Colorado river basin, in which we operate a high-risk facility and 16 low risk facilities, to become more stressed over time. Caesars is proactively working to decrease freshwater withdrawal from this basin through stakeholder engagement and more efficient technologies.
Water quality at a basin/catchment level	Relevant, always included	Water quality at a basin/catchment level is considered a highly relevant contextual issue as it has the potential to impact the health and safety of our stakeholders and our ability to operate critical building systems. Water quality is factored into our risk assessment throughout the organization. We evaluate return flow ratios and upstream protected land for the main aquifers impacted by our operations and value chain. We use information gathered by our Enterprise Risk Management, Sustainable Operations, and Facilities & Engineering teams, along using the WRI's Aqueduct tool to complete our water risk assessment. In response to water quality issues identified across the organization, Caesars has installed monitoring equipment at various facilities. Water quality parameters are monitored closely by our Sustainable Operations function. If monitoring showed continued risk, Caesars plans to invest in advanced filtration equipment or more robust operational equipment. According to the WRI Aqueduct tool, Coastal New Jersey (Kirkwood Cohansey Aquifer) generally has high return flow ratios and extremely low upstream protected land. These conditions lead to poor water quality and the potential for damage to water-using systems and equipment, including washing machines, cooling towers, chillers, boilers, piping, faucets, and toilets.
Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level	Relevant, always included	Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level is considered a relevant contextual issue and is always considered in our risk assessment. We ensure we are in compliance with local regulation at all times as this is crucial in avoiding current and future conflict among stakeholder groups. With respect to the potential for conflict concerning water resources, we consider our key stakeholders to include all water users that share local water resources. Stakeholder conflicts are assessed throughout the entire organization by our Enterprise Risk Management, Community Engagement/CSR, and Sustainable Operations teams. Caesars engages with Southern Nevada Water Authority on local Southern Nevada items and the Sustainable Hospitality Alliance for national items. 90% of the Southern Nevada's water comes from the Colorado River and Caesars supports efforts to protect the Colorado River, a source of water for over 20 Caesars properties. Of the Caesars properties that depend on the Colorado River for their water source, results from WRI's Aqueduct tool, which was used to complete a water risk assessment, indicate that 4 properties are currently at med-high risk.
Implications of water on your key commodities/raw materials	Relevant, always included	The implications of water on our key commodities/raw materials are considered a relevant contextual issue, and we regularly assess it using WRI's Aqueduct tool. Supply chain locations are entered and scored. Since 2019, beef, produce and energy supply were all considered at risk. The reliable availability of the key commodities is crucial in maintaining the operation of our kitchens and restaurants. Caesars is proactively planning for water-related impact on beef and produce through developing alternate supplier lists; alternate suppliers will be more reliable during a water shortage event because they are selected based on geographic locations with less water stress. The implications of water on beef and produce are monitored closely by our Sourcing and Sustainable Operations functions. For example, in the unfortunate event of a water shortage effecting the San Joaquin basin, Caesars will not be the only organization looking to alternate suppliers for produce. We must maintain a pulse on water risk on our supply chain so that we may minimize the impact of risk-related events to our business operations.
Water-related regulatory frameworks	Relevant, always included	Both impending legislation and existing regulatory frameworks are considered highly relevant contextual issues as compliance is essential for the responsible management of our water-related activities. Frameworks and tariffs are reviewed by Sustainable Operations at a local level as a part of our ongoing risk assessment. Regulation risk is also assessed at a facility level using WRI's Aqueduct tool. Relevant developments are incorporated into our company-wide risk and water management strategies. As the main link between regulators and Caesars Leadership, our Community Engagement/CSR team engages with local legislators, policy makers and stakeholders on regulation, risks, stewardship and management plans for certain regions. For example, in Las Vegas, Sustainable Operations and Design & Construction groups work with the local water district to ensure that existing and new properties are in line with local landscape regulations. Caesars has incorporated the installation of climate appropriate landscaping (no turf) into our water management strategy.
Status of ecosystems and habitats	Relevant, always included	The state of ecosystems and habitats is considered a highly relevant contextual issue. Caesars always incorporates impacts on the local water dependent ecosystems into our risk assessments using WRI's Aqueduct tool. The health of ecosystems and habitats is fundamental to our commitment to local communities. Ecosystem vulnerability is measured by proxy – the level of identified risk associated with water scarcity and threatened amphibians is considered an indicator of the potential for ecosystem vulnerability. Caesars also recognizes the potential for impact to ecosystems and habitats during construction or renovation of our facilities. On an ongoing basis Caesars collaborates with community stakeholders to identify specific natural areas that may be impacted by our activities. Caesars mitigates the potential disruption to ecosystem by working to minimize water withdrawals. As part of our development practices, we conduct environmental impact assessments including endangered species, soil control and erosion control. During construction, Caesars builds to LEED standards which takes into consideration site selection and mitigation of risk to ecosystems and habitat. When negotiating new contracts, we require developers to complete these studies. We are currently investigating a large-scale solar energy project outside Las Vegas; as part of the permitting process we will require wildlife and other environmental studies with the EPA. This includes assisting in desert tortoise relocation and ensuring all other environmental compliance is met.
Access to fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services for all employees	Relevant, always included	Access to fully-functioning water sanitation and health services for all employees is required for all Caesars locations. These services are factored into the annual water risk assessment through a facility-level review of water quality indicators, including return flow ratio and baseline water stress (upstream protected land and water quantity indicators). In response to the assessment completed using WRI's Aqueduct tool, Caesars has begun measuring water quality on-site.
Other contextual issues, please specify	Please select	

W3.3c

(W3.3c) Which of the following stakeholders are considered in your organization's water-related risk assessments?

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Customers	Relevant, always included	Customers are relevant and always included in our risk assessment process as they are an integral part of our business. Most of our facility-level water use is associated with the services and amenities provided to our estimated 115 million annual customers — guests at our hotels, resorts and casinos and convention and meeting attendees. Caesars hosted over 15,000 conventions and meetings in 2019. Caesars educates our customers about how their water use behavior impacts our conservation success. At Caesars, we make it easy for our guests to conserve natural resources and we strive to encourage this behavior through signage in their rooms. A few easy actions we promote include hanging up towels if they don't need changing, requesting a sheet change only when needed, and turning off the faucet when brushing your teeth or shaving. Additionally, we engage our customers in the water conservation effort through our Customer Survey and use their feedback to improve our performance or celebrate successes. Quarterly audits of our over 40,000 hotel rooms, meeting areas, and 700+ F&B outlets, bars, nightclubs and lounges ensure that water conservation efforts are in place, so guests can easily conserve water while at our properties.
Employees	Relevant, always included	Employees are relevant to our business and are always included in our risk assessment process. Employees are integral to our business operation and help in the identification of water-related risk. Caesars has a global employee base of over 54,000 that may be impacted by our activities. It is paramount that our employees understand why we are focused on water conservation, and Caesars engages with employees through an extensive CodeGreen (CG) awareness and training program which includes information about Caesars water stewardship, our environmental policy, water management strategies and conservation goals. Our employees are the engine behind the success of CG, our environmental strategy, of which a large part is water conservation. Each property has a CG team with members representing different parts of the property's operations and a work plan with details on meeting targets for the year. Our annual CG property plan reports are our preferred communication channel to gather feedback on our progress and to identify water-related risk and opportunity. Results are shared company-wide through our CodeGreen Scorecard, which is available for all properties to view performance on six key metrics (energy, carbon emissions, water, waste, behavior change and customer engagement). Our water metric measures each property's progress towards our company's water reduction goal. Additionally, GMs are incentivized to meet their annual budgets which includes utility expenses. They must find ways to meet the water budget and water usage reduction goals and must decrease water usage if rates increase. Water usage for future new projects is built into the project budget as well.
Investors	Relevant, always included	Investors are relevant to our business and are always included in our risk assessment process, as we see growing concern about water-related risk and corporate sustainability efforts from this stakeholder group. Water risk poses both a challenge and an opportunity for Caesars, and thus is relevant for investors. Caesars engages with investors through a variety of means, including participation in CDP and other voluntary reporting mechanisms. We report on water risk and responses and CodeGreen performance through CDP, mainstream financial reporting, and our publicly available annual CSR report. Quarterly shareholder calls expressed interest in our sustainability efforts. We anticipate that investor involvement will increase in the future.
Local communities	Relevant, always included	Caesars has close ties to local communities and understands that the success of our properties is linked to the success of other local businesses, schools and residents. For this reason, local communities are relevant and are always included in our risk assessment. Local communities represent the most material stakeholders for water-related risk. During the planning, construction and operation of our facilities, Caesars ensures compliance with all local regulations. When the local community experiences a flood, Caesars donates 'HERO Hours' to help rebuild and repair damage due to flood waters. Because strong communities are integral to our success, we encourage all employees to give back on an ongoing basis through our HERO program. Our HERO program enables and empowers employees to be leaders in the communities where we serve. Employees partner with organizations such as Clean the World and National Park Trust. In many regions, Caesars employees partner with local schools and non-profits on conservation and stewardship programs. In 2020, as part of the Southern Indiana Horseshoe facility re-siting project, all perishable goods within the facility including food, beverages, WASH/hygiene equipment, and hotel supplies were donated to the local community organizations.
NGOs	Relevant, always included	We have close, valuable partnerships with NGOs, who share their expertise with us on water-related concerns and opportunities, which is especially helpful with community engagement. NGOs are always considered as a part of our risk assessment, and they are typically engaged at the corporate level. Our CSR Advisory Council includes multisector stakeholders, who are instrumental in keeping Caesars apprised of current science and advising on future strategy. As a member of the Sustainable Hospitality Alliance, our engagement with them helps to design more innovative responses to water risk. We work with various conservation organizations on a regional level such as the Southern Nevada Water Authority to engage local communities on water conservation, sanitation, hygiene, and to raise awareness of water issues.
Other water users at a basin/catchment level	Relevant, always included	Collaborating with other water users at the local level helps identify best practices and new opportunities. We are part of various associations and consortiums locally. One example is our work with the Southern Nevada Water Authority. Collaboration as the basin/catchment level allows local organizations to work together to develop response strategies to water-related risk. The collective understanding of key issues allows us to more efficiently address potential conflict. Our recognition of other water users at a basin/catchment level as relevant stakeholders has allowed us to share and learn strategies and tools to promote water efficiencies and stewardship and work to advance partnership opportunities with local business, water managers, and policy makers. Another example of local engagement is Impact NV (formerly Green Chips), a non-profit that includes 3 cities, county, business and local utilities; Caesars is a founding member and has employees on the chair of Trustees since its inception over 10 years ago.
Regulators	Relevant, always included	As regulations and legislations have a direct impact on our activities, regulators are considered relevant and are always included in our assessment of water-related risk. We engage with local regulators such as state and regional governments and municipalities directly on a regular basis through our participation in industry associations. As the main link between regulators and Caesars Leadership, our Public Affairs team engages with local legislation, policy makers and stakeholders on regulation, risks, stewardship and management plans for certain regions. An example of direct engagement in Las Vegas is our partnership with the local water district to upgrade water system backflows. Due to the age of the Caesars buildings and necessary replumbing, the project may require a Company-wide investment of more than $1M, which is considered a substantive impact for Caesars. While the project was initiated at the facility-level, it is being managed to resolution by Sustainable Operations group in close partnership with the water company to achieve compliance. This water supply reliability project to upgrade the system will reduce the risk associated with aging plumbing and help secure the water system from contamination behind the meters.
River basin management authorities	Relevant, always included	River basin management authorities are considered relevant stakeholders and are always included in our assessment of water-related risk. Proactive management at the river basin level helps to ensure reliability of our water supply. Caesars works with local water purveyors such as the Las Vegas Valley Water District (LVVWD) in Nevada to initiate water conservation efforts. LVVWD is a member of the Southern Nevada Water Authority who supplies water from Colorado river to Nevada. The Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) works closely with the Colorado River Commission who administers Nevada's allocation of water rights from the Colorado River. Our conservation efforts are focused on reducing overall demand on the Colorado River and we're indirectly working with the basin management authority through their designated purveyors. We also engage directly with SNWA.
Statutory special interest groups at a local level	Relevant, always included	Caesars is active with local resort associations as well as other local special interest groups, and therefore they are relevant and always included in our risk assessment process. Water-related legislative issues are a growing focus of these special interest groups, especially in Nevada where the bulk of Caesars operations are located. In Southern Nevada, Caesars is engaged with a local resort association that works with us on proposed and pending legislation. We engaged with them in the past on the proposed LVVWD rate changes due to the new Lake Mead pipeline being built.
Suppliers	Relevant, always included	We consider suppliers relevant and always include them as a part of our annual risk assessment. Caesars requests our 165 key suppliers to respond to the CDP Supply Chain module on an annual basis. By reporting through CDP Supply Chain, we can track water use, risk and management information consistently. The information provided in our suppliers' CDP Supply Chain responses is used to maintain accountability and assess risk within our supply chain. Our annual assessment of CDP Supply Chain responses allows Caesars to evaluate the potential impact of water supply and extreme weather events to logistics.
Water utilities at a local level	Relevant, always included	Water utilities at a local level are considered relevant stakeholders and are included in our annual water risk assessment, as they are one of the main downstream water users. Through the WRI aqueduct tool each Caesars' property, and subsequently each local water utility, is assessed for current and future implications of water issues such as water security, drought severity, upstream storage, media coverage and other aspects directly affecting delivery and cost. Because water issues in Southern Nevada are highly scrutinized, Caesars has developed close partnerships with Las Vegas water purveyors and the Southern Nevada Water Authority. Collaboration includes sharing best practices, participating in case studies and developing programs together. For example, Caesars was engaged with SNWA and LVVWD throughout 2020 on water system reliability issues. This includes installing backflow meters, approximately 5 meters have been installed with nearly 10 more in the planning stage. Increased costs through implementing new meters, backflows, etc. in order to secure the delivery system was included in our risk assessment. Additionally, Caesars regularly participates in water reduction and rebate programs with local utilities.
Other stakeholder, please specify	Please select	

W3.3d

(W3.3d) Describe your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and responding to water-related risks within your direct operations and other stages of your value chain.

For all internal and external influences identified as relevant to our organization's water security and water-related risks, Caesars includes relevant stakeholders as a part of our ongoing risk identification and assessment process. While our direct operations and supply chain are completely covered by our water-related risk assessment, other stages of our value chain are partially covered. We do not have awareness of or information about all water-related aspects of our entire value chain. This level of coverage allows Caesars to set an appropriate water risk management strategy with goals and monitoring activities that address various levels and aspects of operations and our supply chain.

While Caesars works to identify and assess water-related risk on an ongoing basis, our primary procedure for identifying and assessing risk is through the completion of a robust bi-annual water risk assessment performed independently of other risks. Through the water risk assessments, Caesars can measure and classify the potential impact of water-related risk at both the company- and facility-level. Our bi-annual review of water-related risk as a standalone issue is also used to guide or reaffirm our CodeGreen (CG) strategy, water reduction targets and to help frame water efficiency opportunities at high-risk facilities. The CG program was reintroduced to all properties including the new properties from the merger with Eldorado to engage on water-related issues.

Risk assessment outcomes are used to inform internal decisions about how to mitigate, transfer, accept and control water-related risks. Severity of risk is identified based on whether the risk will have a substantive or strategic impact on our business. Water risk is handled strategically with cooperation from several departments including Enterprise Risk Management, Community Engagement/CSR and Facilities & Engineering (which includes Sustainable Operations). Our executive level CSR Advisory Council provides direction and review of sustainability-related matters, including water goals and policy. The Council which has 4 members with expertise in different fields to provide a holistic approach to risk management, meets monthly to discuss water-related strategy, risk management, and assess materiality. They also conduct quarterly townhall presentations to company employees in each of the four respective expertise areas.

Our bi-annual water risk assessment employs the use of multiple tools: the WRI Aqueduct tool used to initially measure and map water risk at the basin level, the Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer to quantify water-related risks in financial terms, and external consultants to help guide the risk assessment process. Our assessment provides detail on existing and future (2020, 2030, 2040) water risks. Because Caesars portfolio is somewhat dynamic, a bi-annual assessment allows for regular updates of both direct operations and supply chain water-related risks.

W4. Risks and opportunities

W4.1

(W4.1) Have you identified any inherent water-related risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

Yes, both in direct operations and the rest of our value chain

W4.1a

(W4.1a) How does your organization define substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

While Caesars works to identify and assess water-related risk on an ongoing basis, our primary procedure for identifying and assessing risk is through the completion of a robust bi-annual water risk assessment performed independently of other risks. Caesars identifies and assesses water-related risk across our direct operations and supply chain as part of CodeGreen, our environmental strategy. Our internal risk model combines output from credible and publicly available industry tools, WRI Aqueduct and Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer, with facility-level consumption data, to identify like likelihood and potential impact of water-related risk. In the context of a water-related risk, Caesars defines substantive impact as any situation or event with the potential to raise shareholder or customer concern for the sustainability of our business or the health and safety of our stakeholders and customers. Declining water quality, increased water stress and flooding have been identified as the most common water risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on our business. Caesars quantifies substantive impact at the corporate level at a threshold of $50k USD. This definition applies to direct operations.

The results of our bi-annual risk assessment indicate 7 facilities with the potential to have a substantive impact on our business, solely due to their geographic location. These 7 facilities are in areas where baseline water stress is equal to or greater than 40% and that withdraw from river basins where water depletion is equal to or greater than 75% on an inter-annual timescale. These 7 facilities pose a potential risk and impact to the sustainability of our business and the health and safety of our stakeholders and customers, because they meet our 40% baseline water stress and 75% water depletion thresholds. Our definition of substantive impact applies to our direct operations as well as our supply chain, and we consider the impact of water-related risk realized by our supply chain partners in our annual risk assessment. If one of our facilities either no longer meets the identified thresholds or a new facility is identified by meeting these thresholds, this would be considered a substantive change.

In 2020, our Lake Charles property in Louisiana was forced to close on August 27th due to extreme and irreparable damage and flooding from Hurricane Laura. The property will remain closed through at least summer 2022 as a new land-based casino and hotel is constructed, at a cost of over $120 million. Since closure, nearly $100M in losses has occurred (not including the $122M in capital to move the property to land). However, $44M was received in insurance receivables. Our company-wide substantive impact threshold is $50k which this event exceeded. Both the extended closure and the re-sitting of the facility on land are considered substantive financial impacts as the financial impact to address displaced employees, emergency response, electrical infrastructure, increased insurance requirements, corrections to damage caused by flood waters, costs to re-sit the barge-based casino on land, and lost revenue cost upward of $178M to complete.

W4.1b

(W4.1b) What is the total number of facilities exposed to water risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business, and what proportion of your company-wide facilities does this represent?

	Total number of facilities exposed to water risk	% company-wide facilities this represents	Comment
Row 1	7	1-25	Seven of our facilities are considered exposed to water risk with the potential to have a substantial financial impact on the business. The term “facility” is used by Caesars to describe a unique Caesars property, which may include more than one fixed building.

W4.1c

(W4.1c) By river basin, what is the number and proportion of facilities exposed to water risks that could have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business, and what is the potential business impact associated with those facilities?

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Number of facilities exposed to water risk
4

% company-wide facilities this represents
1-25

Production value for the metals & mining activities associated with these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s annual electricity generation that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s global oil & gas production volume that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s total global revenue that could be affected
11-20

Comment

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Mississippi River

Number of facilities exposed to water risk
1

% company-wide facilities this represents
1-25

Production value for the metals & mining activities associated with these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s annual electricity generation that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s global oil & gas production volume that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s total global revenue that could be affected
1-10

Comment

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (Kirkwood Cohansey Aquifer)

Number of facilities exposed to water risk
1

% company-wide facilities this represents
1-25

Production value for the metals & mining activities associated with these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company’s annual electricity generation that could be affected by these facilities

<Not Applicable>

% company's global oil & gas production volume that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company's total global revenue that could be affected
1-10

Comment

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (Patapsco/Black River)

Number of facilities exposed to water risk
1

% company-wide facilities this represents
1-25

Production value for the metals & mining activities associated with these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company's annual electricity generation that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company's global oil & gas production volume that could be affected by these facilities
<Not Applicable>

% company's total global revenue that could be affected
1-10

Comment

W4.2

(W4.2) Provide details of identified risks in your direct operations with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business, and your response to those risks.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Declining water quality

Primary potential impact
Increased operating costs

Company-specific description
The Colorado River basin generally has extremely high to high return flow ratios and generally low to extremely low upstream protected land. Both these conditions lead to poor water quality which will have significant financial and strategic impacts to our business operations because the quality and the lifetime of water-using equipment will degrade under poor water quality. Water quality could degrade to the point where it could impact our water-using operational equipment. Increased operating costs will be incurred to properly maintain water-using systems.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
Medium

Likelihood
Unlikely

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

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
4000000

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
6000000

Explanation of financial impact
The financial impact is based on a recurring annual contract in place to monitor and address water quality. This contract includes proprietary monitoring software in addition to quality management and chemical costs. The timescale for this financial impact is ongoing.

Primary response to risk

Increase capital expenditure

Description of response
Caesars' has installed monitoring equipment at various sites throughout our portfolio. We will continue to expand our monitoring to determine if there is a risk to our operational equipment. If monitoring shows continued risk Caesars' will invest in advanced filtration equipment or more robust operational equipment. Time frame for response implementation: less than 1 year. Effectiveness of response: high, we have seen good results from previous installs. Feasibility of preventing financial or operational impacts: high, equipment will be selected to achieve goals.

Cost of response
1500000

Explanation of cost of response
Cost of response for all at-risk facilities is calculated based previous projects completed at similar facilities, with the assumption that the cost of a more robust advanced filtration or more robust operational equipment will be comparable facility to facility. This calculation considers the age of the equipment, and size of the facilities, with equipment costs as the key expenditure item. The timescale for response implementation and cost of response is less than 1 year from the time that increased risk due to water quality is identified.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Increased water stress

Primary potential impact
Other, please specify (Water supply disruption)

Company-specific description
Caesars' owned resorts and casinos in the arid Southwest United States receive their water from Lake Mead, a reservoir on the Colorado River. Since 2000, the Colorado River has been in a drought and local purveyors have enacted new restrictions and costing. Restrictions are a way to prepare for a future of water stress and increased cost are used to pay for new infrastructure. Withdrawal limitations on the Colorado River could have impacts on the availability of water if alternate sources of a water supply are not developed. A water supply disruption would lead to facility closure and suspension of operations as building fire codes require occupant evacuation when the building is not receiving a reliable water supply. A periodic suspension of operations at any of our Colorado River properties would lead to a substantive financial impact (millions in revenue loss per day) and secondarily would lead to decreased guest satisfaction, effecting future business.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
Medium

Likelihood
Unlikely

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

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
8000000

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
12000000

Explanation of financial impact
If water rationing encroaches on our customer's experience, this would pose a substantive risk to revenue as hotel rooms would need to be taken out of service and restaurants would close to reduce water usage. Timescale would be ongoing, or until supplier stops water supply restrictions or an alternative water supply was sourced. There are generally negative financial impacts occurring from lost revenues and equipment replacement costs. Increased water stress in the Colorado River basin is also a risk with the potential to constrain growth within this basin.

Primary response to risk
Increase capital expenditure

Description of response
If the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) and the Las Vegas Valley Water District (LVVWD) ration water due to increased water stress, there will be a large increase in cost and a new set of voluntary or mandatory water stewardship goals. To exceed our reduction goal of 25% by 2025 per air-conditioned square foot against at 2008 baseline, we will need to outlay new capital and work closely with the SNWA and the LVVWD on their plans. Therefore, we would need to consider a vast capital project to develop massive graywater systems, new wells, xeriscaping, and other new technologies to continue to provide our current services. This project is not yet implemented, and the timeframe would be expected to be more than 1 year to complete the response. This response is expected to be very effective in reducing the risk of impact of water stress, and greatly improve Caesars' asset level resilience by reducing on site water demand which would reduce future operational impacts. In 2019, we reduced absolute water consumption by 11% through various informal water efficiency projects and are on track to meet our water reduction and stewardship goals. In 2020, we exceeded this number, partially due to the efforts to reduce water usage during the COVID pandemic closures. We expect 2021 water consumption to return to normal levels.

Cost of response
1000000

Explanation of cost of response
The cost of response strategy was derived based on past facility and operations improvement projects such as cooling tower replacement, chiller maintenance, and the addition of chemical injection systems. Response strategy capex and OpEx projects will be ongoing as there will be constant pressure to reduce water use over the long term.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Mississippi River

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Flooding

Primary potential impact
Other, please specify (Property Damage)

Company-specific description
The property at risk is in the upper Mississippi River basin. Like some of the levees in New Orleans, a retaining wall along an elevated river prevents water from swamping this property. If an upstream dike, dam or lock on that system gave way during an extremely severe storm, 7 feet of water would inundate most of the area. Historically, Caesars has been negatively impacted by flooding in both coastal and riverfront areas resulting in lost revenue, remediation costs, and various impacts to the workforce which can influence property performance. Our business operations in this area will likely experience negative financial impacts if significant flooding events occur in the future.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
High

Likelihood
Very likely

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

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
8000000

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
12000000

Explanation of financial impact
Costs could widely range depending on severity of flooding and the resulting length of property closure. This estimate is based on actual costs occurred during property closure in Q1 2018. High flood waters impacted our property resulting in a closure of over 7 days. Financial impact includes lost revenue, mitigation costs, employee displacement costs, emergency response, electrical infrastructure, increased insurance requirements and corrections to damage caused by flood waters.

Primary response to risk
Develop flood emergency plans

Description of response
Flooding is usually unavoidable, but mitigation strategies and management plans can help minimize the impacts. Currently, we have measures in place on a property-specific basis including supplies on hand to prevent water infiltration and pumping equipment to remove any water that enters the property. If historic water levels begin to rise and flooding occurrence increases, it will be imperative to work with local policy makers to continue to enhance the flood protection in place and develop new infrastructure as a secondary strategy. Additionally, we will work with local jurisdictions to develop the emergency flood plans. Specific to our Lake Charles property in Louisiana, over $122M is expected to be spent to move the casino/hotel facility to land, which would reduce impacts from future extreme weather events. This will result in the ability to continue operations during minor flood and weather events, lessening closures due to floods, which is a very effective response for this risk.

Cost of response
122000000

Explanation of cost of response
Cost of response represents a total one-time cost for Caesars; it is the total relocation cost of the facility in this river basin as a result of flooding. In the event that equipment is damaged and/or supplies are used and must be replenished, additional costs will be incurred.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Mississippi River

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Declining water quality

Primary potential impact
Increased operating costs

Company-specific description
The Mississippi River basin generally has high return flow ratios and generally extremely low upstream protected land. Both these conditions lead to poor water quality which will have significant financial and strategic impacts to our business operations because the quality and the lifetime of water-using equipment will degrade under poor water quality. Water quality could degrade to the point where it could impact our water-using operational equipment. Increased operating costs will be incurred to properly maintain water-using systems.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
Medium-high

Likelihood
Likely

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

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
8000000

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
12000000

Explanation of financial impact
The financial impact is based on previous equipment replacement projects for our central plants, in which equipment could be degraded by worsening water quality. The timescale for this financial impact is ongoing.

Primary response to risk
Increase capital expenditure

Description of response
Caesars has installed monitoring equipment at various sites throughout our portfolio. We will continue to expand our monitoring to determine if there is a risk to our operational equipment. If monitoring reveals continued risk, Caesars will invest in advanced filtration equipment, improved or new chemical treatment, or more robust operational equipment. This specific response project is not yet implemented, and the timeframe would be expected to be more than 1 year to complete the response. This response is expected to be very effective in reducing the risk of impact of water stress, and greatly improve Caesars' asset level resilience by reducing on site water demand which would reduce future operational impacts. We also have proprietary software installed in our operational equipment that guides our water management and operational procedures. For this specific facility, remote monitoring software was installed and set points were set lower to reduce risk of damage to equipment.

Cost of response
1000000

Explanation of cost of response
Cost of response for all at-risk facilities is calculated based previous projects completed at similar facilities, with the assumption that the cost of a more robust advanced filtration or more robust operational equipment will be comparable facility to facility. This calculation considers the age of the equipment, and size of the facilities, with equipment costs as the key expenditure item. The timescale for response implementation and cost of response is less than 1 year from the time that increased risk due to water quality is identified.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (Kirkwood Cohansey Aquifer)

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Declining water quality

Primary potential impact
Increased operating costs

Company-specific description
Coastal New Jersey generally has high return flow ratios and extremely low upstream protected land. Both these conditions lead to poor water quality which will have significant financial and strategic impacts to our business operations because the quality and the lifetime of water-using equipment will degrade under poor water quality. Water quality could degrade to the point where it could impact our water-using operational equipment. Increased operating costs will be incurred to properly maintain water-using systems.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
Medium-high

Likelihood
Likely

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

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
8000000

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
12000000

Explanation of financial impact
The financial impact is based on a recurring annual contract in place to monitor and address water quality. This contract includes proprietary monitoring software in addition to quality management and chemical costs. The timescale for this financial impact is ongoing.

Primary response to risk
Increase geographic diversity of facilities

Description of response
Caesars has installed monitoring equipment at various sites throughout our portfolio. We will continue to expand our monitoring to determine if there is a risk to our operational equipment. If monitoring reveals continued risk, Caesars will invest in advanced filtration equipment or more robust operational equipment. This project is not yet implemented, and the timeframe would be expected to be more than 1 year to complete the response. This response is expected to be very effective in reducing the risk of impact of water stress, and greatly improve Caesars' asset level resilience by reducing on site water demand which would reduce future operational impacts. We also have proprietary software installed in our operational equipment that guides our water management and operational procedures. For this specific facility, remote monitoring software was installed and set points were set lower to reduce risk of damage to equipment.

Cost of response
1000000

Explanation of cost of response
Cost of response for all at-risk facilities is calculated based previous projects completed at similar facilities, with the assumption that the cost of a more robust advanced filtration or more robust operational equipment will be comparable facility to facility. This calculation considers the age of the equipment, and size of the facilities, with equipment costs as the key expenditure item. The timescale for response implementation and cost of response is less than 1 year from the time that increased risk due to water quality is identified.

W4.2a

(W4.2a) Provide details of risks identified within your value chain (beyond direct operations) with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business, and your response to those risks.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (San Joaquin)

Stage of value chain
Supply chain

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Increased water stress

Primary potential impact
Supply chain disruption

Company-specific description
Suppliers of produce are in a water scarce region with an extremely high baseline water stress risk. There is a high level of competition for available water and freshwater availability is an ongoing concern. This particular river basin also sees a high level of fluctuation in river discharge. For these reasons and others, this region is susceptible to increased water costs. If and when water costs rise to a point where suppliers either experience a produce supply shortage or are required to raise the price of their produce so that Caesars experiences a financial impact of more than $50k per site, this would be considered a substantive change for Caesars. In the event that there is a shortage, Caesars would be required to procure produce from alternative suppliers or make substantial changes to their food menus. All Caesars properties incorporating produce into their menu would be impacted. Procuring produce from alternative suppliers would most likely cost more.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
Medium-low

Likelihood
Likely

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
3200000

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact
Calculation of potential financial impact is based on an approximate 10% increase to annual produce costs. The threshold for substantive change to Caesars produce cost is $50k per site increase in food costs. Impact timescale would be indefinite as these products are continually sourced every year. In the context of Caesars' portfolio-wide operations, the procurement of produce from alternate suppliers will have a low to medium negative impact on the cost of goods.

Primary response to risk

Supplier engagement	Other, please specify (Supplier diversification)

Description of response
Caesars is proactively planning for water-related impact on our supply chain through the preparation of alternate supplier lists. Switching from primary to secondary and third tier suppliers is likely going to cost more, but these alternate suppliers will be more reliable during a water shortage event because they are selected based on geographic locations with less water stress. While supplier diversification acts as a safety net, it does not allow Caesars to benefit from primary supplier discounts. In the unfortunate event of a water shortage effecting the San Joaquin basin, Caesars will not be the only business looking to alternate suppliers for their produce. This spike in demand will also drive up prices. This response is not yet implemented but could be implemented and completed in a relatively short time frame (3-6 months). This

timeframe would include an RFP event and contracting with new vendors.

Cost of response
1000000

Explanation of cost of response
The cost of our risk response and management actions is an estimate based on the cost difference between our primary and secondary or third tier suppliers, which would be between 3% and 5%. Every 2-3 years Caesars conducts RFPs for suppliers. This cost estimate assumes that future demand for services and products is more-or-less the same for what is supplied to Caesars today. We anticipate that response implementation and cost impact associated with the response to be less than 6 months. Effectiveness of response: high, multiple suppliers exist.

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Mississippi River

Stage of value chain
Supply chain

Type of risk & Primary risk driver

Physical	Declining water quality

Primary potential impact
Supply chain disruption

Company-specific description
Suppliers of cattle are in an area of the country that is highly dependent on the use of discharged and treated wastewater. Over time, suppliers may begin to incur higher operational costs resulting from more stringent water monitoring. In the event the water quality is unacceptable, Caesars' beef supply may be disrupted. In this case, Caesars would be required to procure beef from alternative suppliers or make substantial changes to their food menus. All Caesars properties incorporating beef into their menu would be impacted. Procuring beef from alternative suppliers would most likely cost more.

Timeframe
More than 6 years

Magnitude of potential impact
Low

Likelihood
Unlikely

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
5100000

Potential financial impact figure - minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure - maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact
Calculation of potential financial impact is based on an approximate 10% increase to annual beef costs. The threshold for substantive change to Caesars beef cost is $50k per site increase in food costs.. Impact timescale would be indefinite as these products are continually sourced every year. In the context of Caesars' portfolio-wide operations, the procurement of produce from alternate suppliers will have a low to medium negative impact on the cost of goods

Primary response to risk

Supplier engagement	Other, please specify (Supplier Diversification)

Description of response
Caesars is proactively planning for water-related impact on our supply chain through the preparation of alternate supplier lists. Switching from primary to secondary and third tier suppliers is likely going to cost more, but these alternate suppliers will be more reliable during a water shortage event because they are selected based on geographic locations with less of a water scarcity risk. While supplier diversification acts as a safety net, it does not allow Caesars to benefit from primary supplier discounts. In the unfortunate event of a water quality issue effecting the Mississippi River basin, Caesars will not be the only business looking to alternate suppliers for their beef. This spike in demand will also drive up prices. This response is not yet implemented but could be implemented and completed in a relatively short time frame (3-6 months). This timeframe would include an RFP event and contracting with new vendors.

Cost of response
1750000

Explanation of cost of response
The cost of our risk response and management actions is an estimate based on the cost difference between our primary and secondary or third tier suppliers, which would be between 3% and 5%. Every 2-3 years Caesars conducts RFPs for suppliers. This cost estimate assumes that future demand for services and products is more-or-less the same for what is supplied to Caesars today. We anticipate that response implementation and cost impact associated with the response to be less than 6 months. Effectiveness of response: high, multiple suppliers exist.

W4.3

(W4.3) Have you identified any water-related opportunities with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?
Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

W4.3a

(W4.3a) Provide details of opportunities currently being realized that could have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

Type of opportunity
Efficiency

Primary water-related opportunity
Improved water efficiency in operations

Company-specific description & strategy to realize opportunity
Cooling water projects are in progress which could result in greatly increasing the amount of water recycled through loops, saving tens of millions of gallons per site per year. With the installation of water reclamation and reuse systems in our cooling towers, Caesars has saved over 7.68 billion gallons of water since 2008. Cooling system water reuse volumes are monitored in real time to ensure that we are maintaining proper levels and that systems are functioning optimally. Close monitoring of these systems has not revealed any issues. Into the future, we are planning to install more efficient cooling towers to replace cooling towers as they age, which will further reduce water usage and increase the amount of recycled water. This opportunity has the potential to have a substantive financial and strategic impact on our business, as water rates continue to rise year over year. This opportunity applies to over 35 sites with cooling towers. Caesars is also motivated to ensure that these systems are well maintained because there is projected water risk across the portfolio associated with the availability of freshwater. This opportunity originated in areas of high-risk that are prone to drought. Caesars has since installed systems more broadly throughout the portfolio. In addition to reducing water lost through evaporation, Caesars is implementing optimized controls, completing retro-commissioning projects, and implementing efficient space operation (i.e., temperature set points).

Estimated timeframe for realization
Current - up to 1 year

Magnitude of potential financial impact
High

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

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
500000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
1000000

Explanation of financial impact
Potential financial impact is estimated based on average annual measurement of 40 million gallons of reused water and future water rate projections.

W5. Facility-level water accounting

W5.1

(W5.1) For each facility referenced in W4.1c, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Facility reference number
Facility 1

Facility name (optional)
Harrah's Ak-Chin

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Latitude
33.024

Longitude
-112.04

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
73.29

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Higher

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
73.29

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
62.3

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Higher

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
62.3

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)
10.99

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Higher

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals. Water withdrawals, discharges and consumption are higher due to facility expansion in 2020.

Facility reference number
Facility 7

Facility name (optional)
Caesars Palace Las Vegas

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Latitude
36.11

Longitude
-115.17

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
1413.96

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Lower

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
1413.96

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
1210.87

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Lower

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
1210.87

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)
212.09

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Lower

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals.

Facility reference number
Facility 12

Facility name (optional)
Harrah's Atlantic City

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (Kirkwood Cohansey Aquifer)

Latitude
39.38

Longitude
-74.42

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
604.75

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Lower

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
604.75

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
514.04

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Lower

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
514.04

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)
90.71

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Lower

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals.

Facility reference number
Facility 18

Facility name (optional)
Harrah's Joliet

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Mississippi River

Latitude
41.52

Longitude
-88.08

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
44.28

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Lower

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
44.28

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
37.64

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Lower

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
37.64

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)

6.64

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Lower

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals.

Facility reference number
Facility 29

Facility name (optional)
Planet Hollywood Las Vegas

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Latitude
36.1

Longitude
-115.17

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
600.21

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Lower

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
600.21

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
510.18

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Lower

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
510.18

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)
90.03

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Lower

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals.

Facility reference number
Facility 31

Facility name (optional)
Harrah's Southern California

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

Latitude
33.26

Longitude
-116.95

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
280.98

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Lower

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
280.98

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
0

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
238.83

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Lower

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
238.83

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)
42.15

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Lower

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals.

Facility reference number
Facility 35

Facility name (optional)
Horseshoe Baltimore

Country/Area & River basin

United States of America	Other, please specify (Patapsco/Black River)

Latitude
39.27

Longitude
-76.62

Located in area with water stress
Yes

Primary power generation source for your electricity generation at this facility
<Not Applicable>

Oil & gas sector business division
<Not Applicable>

Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters/year)
40.11

Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year
Lower

Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes
0

Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable
0

Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable
0

Withdrawals from produced/entrained water
0

Withdrawals from third party sources
40.11

Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters/year)
34.09

Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year
Lower

Discharges to fresh surface water
0

Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater
0

Discharges to groundwater
0

Discharges to third party destinations
34.09

Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters/year)
6.02

Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year
Lower

Please explain
We calculate annual water consumption estimates by subtracting discharge estimates from withdrawals. Annual discharge is estimated to be 85% of total withdrawals.

W5.1a

(W5.1a) For the facilities referenced in W5.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been externally verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

% verified
76-100

What standard and methodology was used?
Water data was externally verified, using similar standards to ISO 14064–3:2006. Internal staff were interviewed, and historical water data and records were verified. Per CDP guidance, if any of the water aspects requested in W5.1d are assured globally then 100% of that water aspect is verified.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

% verified
76-100

What standard and methodology was used?
Water data was externally verified, using similar standards to ISO 14064–3:2006. Internal staff were interviewed, and historical water data and records were verified. Per CDP guidance, if any of the water aspects requested in W5.1d are assured globally then 100% of that water aspect is verified.

Water withdrawals – quality

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water discharges – total volumes

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water discharges – volume by destination

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water discharges – volume by treatment method

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water discharge quality – quality by standard effluent parameters

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water discharge quality – temperature

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water consumption – total volume

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

Water recycled/reused

% verified
Not verified

What standard and methodology was used?
<Not Applicable>

W6. Governance

W6.1

(W6.1) Does your organization have a water policy?

Yes, we have a documented water policy that is publicly available

W6.1a

(W6.1a) Select the options that best describe the scope and content of your water policy.

	Scope	Content	Please explain
Row 1	Company-wide	Reference to international standards and widely-recognized water initiatives Company water targets and goals Commitment to align with public policy initiatives, such as the SDGs Commitments beyond regulatory compliance Commitment to water-related innovation Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation	Our Environmental Policy, which articulates our water dependency, commitments and challenges, and the ways that we act to meet our water commitments, is company-wide in scope and is our commitment to each property, employee, and customer. The nature of our business, hospitality, has a large impact on water and, therefore, water stewardship is an integral part of the strategy. We are committed to enriching communities with tangible economic value while operating responsibly. The purpose of the policy is to make clear our commitments both internally and externally which are expected to be followed by employees at all facilities. Water issues are integrated into Code of Commitment and PEOPLE PLANET PLAY Corporate Responsibility framework via our CodeGreen (CG) strategy. CG is a data-driven environmental program that engages our employees, guests, communities, and suppliers. For suppliers, we emphasize water-related standards for procurement because we recognize the linkage between water consumption and emissions. This effort goes beyond regulatory compliance, and we emphasize stakeholder awareness. The policy content identified is representative of CG water policy, which is outlined in 5 sections: 1) CG Strategy / Our Commitment; 2) Environmental Performance; 3) Stakeholder Communications and Engagement; 4) Environmental Management & Organizational Alignment; and 5) Our PLANET Goals (including water reduction target). We are committed to the human right, sanitation, and health issues, and aligned with public policy initiatives such as the Center for Disease Control (CDC)'s Global Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) programs through our water policy as these relate to our people element of our Code of Commitment. We are also committed to continuously improving our business by investing in new technologies and proactively managing water in the river basins we operate in. Therefore, we invest in sustainable practices to bolster water conservation by retrofitting existing properties and building construction to LEED equivalent standards. We will continue to implement ways to reduce water footprint in both direct operations and supply chain to minimize impacts to the communities that we call home.

W6.2

(W6.2) Is there board level oversight of water-related issues within your organization?

Yes

W6.2a

(W6.2a) Identify the position(s) (do not include any names) of the individual(s) on the board with responsibility for water-related issues.

Position of individual	Please explain
Other C-Suite Officer	The Chief Legal Officer (CLO) is responsible for identifying, assessing, and managing overall risks for Caesars. This also includes oversight of water-related issues and responding to address water risks. As one of the most geographically diversified casino-entertainment company, water is a critical component in maintaining business operations and, therefore, water-related risks are considered a priority. For example, in 2020, water temperature and treatment were identified as potential risks. The CLO made the decision to install systems to reduce water-borne illnesses and to maintain staffs to manage the new systems to prevent water stagnation.
Board-level committee	At the board level, the Corporate Social Responsibility Committee (CSRC) has responsibility for water-related issues. The CSRC is appointed by and acts on behalf of the Board of Directors. The CSRC evaluates emergent environmental, social and governance-related risks and Caesars social and environmental goals, including the policies and programs instrumental in achieving short – and long-term targets for water, emissions, waste and supplier engagement. Periodically, and at least annually, management prepares and presents to the CSRC committee a review of ESG-related risks, including water related issues. Furthermore, management presents, and the Committee evaluates, programs and policies instrumental in achieving water-related goals. The Committee is also responsible for drawing upon external expertise in water-related issues, sustainability and social issues from the CEO-level External CSR Advisory Council and NGO partners.

W6.2b

(W6.2b) Provide further details on the board's oversight of water-related issues.

	Frequency that water-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which water-related issues are integrated	Please explain
Row 1	Scheduled - some meetings	Monitoring implementation and performance Overseeing acquisitions and divestiture Overseeing major capital expenditures Providing employee incentives Reviewing and guiding annual budgets Reviewing and guiding business plans Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding corporate responsibility strategy Setting performance objectives	The Caesars Board of Directors (BOD) and the Board appointed Corporate Social Responsibility Committee (CSRC) take an active role in oversight of water-related issues by primarily reviewing and guiding Environmental, Social & Governance related business plans and strategy with the information provided by the CSR Advisory Council and other internal stakeholders. The Council, made up of four external environmental experts, reviews and guides the overall Corporate Responsibility strategy, sustainability goals including water reduction targets, and CodeGreen implementation and performance. For example, the BOD approves annual budgets, which incorporate water performance objectives and utility cost reduction strategies, based on the information provided by the Council. Major capital expenditures require committee approval, which includes a member of the BOD. Major plans of action related to water issues are reviewed by the Council and approved by the BOD, CSRC, and/or the executive team depending on the level of business impact. When evaluating properties for acquisition under the Caesars Entertainment brand, Caesars undertakes careful consideration of site characteristics and how environmental and climate-related risks could impact the facilities. The CSO, who is responsible for managing broader environmental and governance strategy, also provides regular updates to the CSRC on water-related metrics, performance targets, project approvals and implementation, and risks. Such governance mechanisms help improve the readiness and intelligence on water-related issues and contributes to better oversight of the BOD on water-related issues.

W6.3

(W6.3) Provide the highest management-level position(s) or committee(s) with responsibility for water-related issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

Responsibility
Both assessing and managing water-related risks and opportunities

Frequency of reporting to the board on water-related issues
Quarterly

Please explain
The CSO manages the overarching sustainability program & water-related strategy of CodeGreen. The CSO has responsibility for broader environmental & governance issues & the authority & influence to act on water-related risks/opportunities. The process of monitoring water & environmental issues is primarily through quarterly meetings with the Director of Sustainable Operations. These meetings address progress towards goals, changes in business operations that have water-related implications & emergent risks/opportunities. The quarterly report out includes info on metrics, target performance, enviro goals & emergent risks. Info of material nature resulting from these meetings is provided to the Corporate Social Responsibility Committee Board Sub-Committee to assist in the evaluation of emergent risks & goals including the policies & programs instrumental in achieving short & long-term targets. The CSO has 6 direct reports & reports directly to the CAO, who reports to the CEO & the Board.

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)
Sustainability committee

Responsibility
Both assessing and managing water-related risks and opportunities

Frequency of reporting to the board on water-related issues
Quarterly

Please explain
The CSR Advisory Council reviews and provides direction on water goals & policies. The Council is made up of environmental experts and works directly with the CSO. The CSO provides regular updates to the Council and the Council reviews program implementation & water stewardship performance. Our CodeGreen at Home (now called “People Planet Play Rewards”) program which incentivizes employees is reviewed by the Council (this program paused after March 2020 and resumed in mid-2021). Annual water budgets are reviewed by an internal executive team, which includes input from Council members. Sustainability targets, including water reduction targets are reviewed by the Council & approved at the CEO level. CodeGreen strategy is reviewed and guided by the Council. Any major plans of action related to water issues is reviewed by the Council & approved by the executive team and/or BOD depending on the business impact. The council is directly appointed by the Board of Directors and reports to them.

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)
Environment/Sustainability manager

Responsibility
Both assessing and managing water-related risks and opportunities

Frequency of reporting to the board on water-related issues
Quarterly

Please explain
Environment/Sustainability Manager, Director of Sustainable Operations, is responsible for day-to-day water-related responsibilities, including program and goal implementation and other water-related activities. This position tracks all relevant water-related data (i.e. water usage at all sites) and tracks progress towards water-related goals set by Caesars. The Director of Sustainable Operations also has the responsibility for energy procurement, including sourcing renewable energy options for all sites. Energy procurement has a significant indirect impact on water use which is particularly important when operating in water-stressed geographic regions. The Director of Sustainable Operations reports to the Senior Vice President of Engineering & Asset Management, who directly reports to the President/COO.

W6.4

(W6.4) Do you provide incentives to C-suite employees or board members for the management of water-related issues?

	Provide incentives for management of water-related issues	Comment
Row 1	Yes	

W6.4a

(W6.4a) What incentives are provided to C-suite employees or board members for the management of water-related issues (do not include the names of individuals)?

	Role(s) entitled to incentive	Performance indicator	Please explain
Monetary reward	Corporate executive team	Reduction of water withdrawals	C-suite employees are incentivized to reduce any operational spend, which includes utility costs such as water withdrawal costs. By reducing on site water withdrawals, operational costs are lowered annually resulting in financial incentives to C-suite employees. Monetary reward is in place and overall contribution to the bottom line is considered but there is no direct linkage between the performance indicator and the incentive in terms of timescale.
Non-monetary reward	Chief Purchasing Officer (CPO)	Supply chain engagement	The Chief Purchasing Officer (CPO) manages the overall supply chain engagement, awareness initiatives, and the performs the vendor/supplier selection based on the environmental and sustainability performance of the suppliers.

W6.5

(W6.5) Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on water through any of the following?

Yes, direct engagement with policy makers
Yes, trade associations
Yes, funding research organizations

W6.5a

(W6.5a) What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities seeking to influence policy are consistent with your water policy/water commitments?

We monitor all external relationships and review at least annually to ensure all relationships are in compliance. Any activities associated with trade associations or funding research organization must comply with Caesars overarching sustainability policy and CodeGreen program. Our strategy is to fulfill guest expectations, engage team members and leverage their ideas and energy into investments that improve our business and environmental performance. There are direct engagements with local policy makers on water-related issues. For example, Caesars is part of the Nevada Resort Association (NRA) which is made up of gaming and resort companies in Las Vegas. The NRA engages with local policy makers such as the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) to engage on different topics including recent water rage changes and increasing investment in water-related infrastructure.

Standard operating procedures (SOP) are in place to maintain consistency: Team leads including housekeeping staffs and chefs are required to follow SOPs on energy, water, and waste management. Non-compliance with the SOP can result in meetings and training sessions to review and help employees meet all requirements. If inconsistencies are discovered, corrective actions are taken, including a review of SOPs and if necessary, disciplinary actions including write-ups and action plans.

W6.6

(W6.6) Did your organization include information about its response to water-related risks in its most recent mainstream financial report?

Yes (you may attach the report - this is optional)
2019-2020 Caesars CSR.pdf
CZR_10-K_2020.pdf

W7. Business strategy

W7.1

(W7.1) Are water-related issues integrated into any aspects of your long-term strategic business plan, and if so how?

	Are water-related issues integrated?	Long-term time horizon (years)	Please explain
Long-term business objectives	Yes, water-related issues are integrated	21-30	Caesars long-term business objectives are driven by many internal & external factors, including a corporate commitment to water conservation & efficiency. As the world's most geographically diversified casino-entertainment company, it is imperative that we maintain a strong foundation of providing great service & excellent products to our guests. Our consideration for & proactive mgmt of water as a part of CodeGreen, our environmental strategy, & a strategic priority for our business, allows Caesars to fulfill guest expectations while engaging team members & continuously improving our business. Water-related issues are integrated into our long-term business planning at the corporate level, as water supply poses a long-term risk & is considered strategically relevant. Our companywide effort to reduce water consumption across all facilities is motivated by future projections for lack of water availability, the anticipation of higher water costs over the long term & shifts in consumer behavior. In 2014 we announced our current public goals to reduce water consumption by 20% per air-conditioned sq. foot by 2020 which was achieved in 2015. & 25% per air-conditioned sq. foot by 2025. Our water reduction efforts help mitigate physical risks by reducing our dependence on freshwater. In 2020, we met our long-term goal. However, this was mainly attributed to our efforts to reduce usage during mandated COVID closures. We expect usage to increase in 2021 with normal operations resuming.
Strategy for achieving long-term objectives	Yes, water-related issues are integrated	21-30	Environmental stewardship is an integral part of our business strategy. We are committed to enriching communities with tangible economic value, while operating responsibly. Water-related issues specifically have been integrated into the Caesars Code of Commitment and our PEOPLE PLANET PLAY Corporate Responsibility framework via our CodeGreen (CG) environmental strategy. The CG is a data-driven and disciplined environmental program that engages our employees, guests, communities and suppliers. To maintain a strong foundation of providing great service and excellent products, Caesars is committed to continuously improving our business by investing in new technologies and proactively managing water in the river basins where we operate. Highlights of our strategy include the installation of low-flow showerheads and aerators, new design standards for end-use water fixtures, the institution of drought-tolerant native vegetation whenever possible, guest-facing linen and towel programs and reuse of recycled water for cooling. Caesars has invested in real-time monitoring technologies to reclaim and reuse a large amount of water in our cooling tower operations. Average measurements indicate that recycled water used for cooling saves 40 million gallons annually. Caesars is proactively replacing older towers with newer, more efficient technology that uses less freshwater .
Financial planning	Yes, water-related issues are integrated	21-30	Water-related issues, primarily water scarcity and water cost, are integrated into financial planning at Caesars. Through our CodeGreen environmental strategy, we have a dedicated budget for water efficiency and conservation projects. For example, we allocated several million dollars to water efficiency projects such as central plants and cooling tower upgrades that reduced freshwater consumption. We set annual budgets for each site with respect to water and sewer costs.

W7.2

(W7.2) 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?

Row 1

Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)
0

Anticipated forward trend for CAPEX (+/- % change)
10

Water-related OPEX (+/- % change)
-26

Anticipated forward trend for OPEX (+/- % change)
30

Please explain
CAPEX: Caesars continues to invest in capital projects to reduce freshwater usage, however CapEx spend in 2020 and 2019 was lower than 2018 as more capital was spent on energy projects the last two years (which see an indirect water reduction). However, we expect water projects to increase in 2020 as we look at implementing projects at our newly merged properties. OPEX: Increasing unit costs resulted in an increase in water-related opex spend. However, overall spend was considerably lower due to reduced water usage as a result of our efforts to reduce usage during mandated COVID closures. We expect usage to increase in 2021 with normal operations resuming which would result in opex spend to increase to normal levels. We anticipate rising water costs to continue annually.

W7.3

(W7.3) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its business strategy?

	Use of climate-related scenario analysis	Comment
Row 1	Yes	The 2-degree Celsius scenario (2DS) analysis was used to develop Caesars Science-Based emission reduction targets (SBT). We are planning to reset the SBT targets in 2022 based on new company baselines.

W7.3a

(W7.3a) Has your organization identified any water-related outcomes from your climate-related scenario analysis?
Yes

W7.3b

(W7.3b) What water-related outcomes were identified from the use of climate-related scenario analysis, and what was your organization's response?

	Climate-related scenarios and models applied	Description of possible water-related outcomes	Company response to possible water-related outcomes
Row 1	2DS	We recognize that water supply issues are exaggerated by increasing changes to climate. As seen in the desert southwest the past decade, heatwaves and droughts are increasing in frequency and length. In 2020, the desert southwest underwent a dramatic heat wave in July and as a result electric pricing was elevated to record highs. Contributing to this was reductions in available hydro power due to prolonged drought. Caesars was exposed to the increase pricing and as a result investigated way to reduce this future scenario from repeating. Possible water related outcome in the future: Based on current trends we would expect the drought and heat waves to continue into the immediate and long-term future. This will result in higher priced electricity and water for our largest properties. Electricity reliability will also be affected: our Nevada sites could experience gird emergencies and be required to reduce electric consumption or even trip breakers to reduce usage. This would directly affect our business as we could not operate hotels, slot machines or restaurants without reliable power. Building will also be uninhabitable if long term power outages occur resulting in extreme indoor temperatures.	Development of climate change science-based targets to do our part in order to meet Paris Climate Agreement. This target aims to reduce 100% of emissions by 2050. Additionally, specific to the desert southwest, Caesars is in the midst of securing a long-term purchase power agreement for solar energy. This will enable us to reduce our dependence on market energy, reducing our exposure to drought/heatwave related price increases and any future electricity supply issues. We are also investigating on site generation (micro grids) and on site solar and battery installations to enable us to operate during electric grid emergencies.

W7.4

(W7.4) Does your company use an internal price on water?

Row 1

Does your company use an internal price on water?
No, but we are currently exploring water valuation practices

Please explain
We currently do not use an internal price on water but have begun internal discussions and are conducting preliminary research into the scope of work. This includes researching latest publications, and conducting peer benchmarks. The water valuation schemes we are exploring stem from regulatory costs.

W8. Targets

W8.1

(W8.1) Describe your approach to setting and monitoring water-related targets and/or goals.

	Levels for targets and/or goals	Monitoring at corporate level	Approach to setting and monitoring targets and/or goals
Row 1	Company-wide targets and goals Business level specific targets and/or goals Activity level specific targets and/or goals Site/facility specific targets and/or goals Country level targets and/or goals Basin specific targets and/or goals	Targets are monitored at the corporate level Goals are monitored at the corporate level	We have established company-wide and country-specific goals guided by the best science available. Targets and goals setting were driven by our environmental strategy, CodeGreen, and SDG 6. Different targets were established at the business level, activity level, and site level. For example, activity level targets include reducing laundered materials during housekeeping and these targets are monitored through a bi-annual scorecard. Similarly, targets for Las Vegas were heavily influenced by the SDG 6 to reduce water use in this drought-prone area. Our company-wide effort to reduce water consumption across all facilities is motivated by future projections with access to adequate fresh water supply, the anticipation of higher water costs over the long term and shifts in consumer behavior. In 2014, we announced our current public goals to reduce water consumption by 20% per air-conditioned square foot by 2020 and 25% per air-conditioned square foot by 2025. Our water reduction efforts help mitigate physical risks by reducing our dependence on freshwater.

W8.1a

(W8.1a) Provide details of your water targets that are monitored at the corporate level, and the progress made.

Target reference number
Target 1

Category of target
Water withdrawals

Level
Company-wide

Primary motivation
Water stewardship

Description of target
Baseline was set in 2008. Intensity targets were originally set at 10% reduction by 2015 and 15% reduction by 2020 per thousand sq. ft. of air-conditioned space. Because the 15% reduction was achieved before 2015, new targets of 20% by 2020 and 25% by 2025 were set in 2014. In 2017 Caesars achieved a 22% reduction in water usage per thousand sq. ft. The 2020 target was achieved in 2015 and we are working towards the 2025 target. This reduction can be attributed to operation performance (e.g., employee programs at our properties), capital investment (e.g., retro commissioning, water treatment improvements) and guest education (reduced laundry usage per guest room night). Caesars strategically identified key Sustainability Development Goals by which to map to: SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being); SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities).

Quantitative metric
Other, please specify (consumption per 1,000 conditioned sq.ft.)

Baseline year
2008

Start year
2008

Target year
2020

% of target achieved
100

Please explain
This target was achieved in 2015

Target reference number
Target 2

Category of target
Water withdrawals

Level
Company-wide

Primary motivation
Water stewardship

Description of target
Baseline was set in 2008. Intensity targets were originally set at 10% reduction by 2015 and 15% reduction by 2020 per thousand sq. ft. of air-conditioned space. Because the 15% reduction was achieved before 2015, new targets of 20% by 2020 and 25% by 2025 were set in 2014. In 2017 Caesars achieved a 22% reduction in water usage per thousand sq. ft. The 2020 target was achieved in 2015 and we are working towards the 2025 target. This reduction can be attributed to operation performance (i.e., employee programs at our properties), capital investment (e.g., retro commissioning, water treatment improvements) and guest education (reduced laundry usage per guest room night). Caesars strategically identified key Sustainability Development Goals by which to map to: SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being); SDG 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth) and SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities).

Quantitative metric
Other, please specify (consumption per 1,000 conditioned sq.ft.)

Baseline year
2008

Start year
2008

Target year
2025

% of target achieved
96

Please explain
This target is on pace to be achieved by 2025.

W8.1b

(W8.1b) Provide details of your water goal(s) that are monitored at the corporate level and the progress made.

Goal
Engaging with customers to help them minimize product impacts

Level
Company-wide

Motivation
Water stewardship

Description of goal
Engaging with customers is an important goal to Caesars because we are a hospitality company, mainly serving guests at our hotels and resorts. The impacts of water use from guests make up a significant portion of our overall water usage. Guests are given the option to reuse towels and other linens during their stay at our hotel properties. The reuse of linens saves both water and energy, as well as transportation to and from laundry facilities. This is both a cost savings and a water savings for Caesars. In 2015, Caesars launched an "Operational Excellence" program that measured our hotel laundry per guest room night. Properties were encouraged to improve guest and employee education to reduce their weight of laundry. A baseline was taken in August 2015 and properties are ranked monthly with their progress towards the reduction goal of 5% by laundered weight. This program will be refreshed in 2021-2022 with updated program goals and baselines.. This program is inclusive of all properties with hotel operations.

Baseline year
2015

Start year
2015

End year
2020

Progress
As of December 2019, 67% of properties had reduced their laundry weight per room night by over 5%, which will drive cost savings and reduce water usage. Overall, the laundry weight per room night showed a 16% reduction since implementing this program. In 2020, OpEx was still in place from January through March. However, from March to December, our properties reduced or eliminated housekeeping services due to COVID related restrictions. Therefore, any occupied rooms during that period were compliant with the OpEx. OpEx will return and focus on laundry reductions, room thermostat settings, and other guest room efficiency metrics. Indicators used to track progress will include monitoring utility usage for hotels and laundry cost reductions. Progress will be measured against metrics at least annually and as much as quarterly. Success thresholds will be developed. Indicator Example: Laundry usage per room night Threshold of success: +/-5% adjustments would be deemed successful

W9. Verification

W9.1

(W9.1) Do you verify any other water information reported in your CDP disclosure (not already covered by W5.1a)?
Yes

W9.1a

(W9.1a) Which data points within your CDP disclosure have been verified, and which standards were used?

Disclosure module	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
W1 Current state	Water Withdrawal data	ISAE 3000	Water data was externally verified along with Caesars GHG data, using International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000. Internal staff were interviewed, and historical water data and records were verified. We choose to verify water data with our GHG data to show our commitment to public reporting and accountability of resource usage. We chose an acceptable standard for verification.

W10. Sign off

W-FI

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

W10.1

(W10.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP water response.

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	President and Chief Operating Officer	Chief Operating Officer (COO)

W10.2

(W10.2) Please indicate whether your organization agrees for CDP to transfer your publicly disclosed data on your impact and risk response strategies to the CEO Water Mandate's Water Action Hub [applies only to W2.1a (response to impacts), W4.2 and W4.2a (response to risks)].

No

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I am submitting to	Public or Non-Public Submission
I am submitting my response	Investors	Public

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms