

Independent Assurance Statement to AptarGroup

ERM Certification and Verification Services (ERM CVS) was engaged by AptarGroup to provide limited assurance in relation to specified 2017 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) data in its 2018 CDP submission as set out below.

Engagement summary	
Scope of our assurance engagement	Whether the corporate 2017 GHG data for the following selected indicators are fairly presented, in all material respects, in accordance with the reporting criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scope 1 GHG emissions in tonnes of CO₂e, covering natural gas and fuel oil use and refrigerant leakage• Scope 2 GHG emissions (location-based) in tonnes of CO₂e• Scope 2 GHG emissions (market-based) in tonnes of CO₂e
Reporting criteria	The WBCSD/WRI GHG Protocol Corporate Standard (GHG protocol).
Assurance standard	ERM CVS' assurance methodology, based on the International Standard on Assurance Engagements ISAE 3000 (Revised).
Assurance level	Limited assurance
Respective responsibilities	AptarGroup is responsible for preparing the data and for its correct presentation in the Report to third parties, including disclosure of the reporting criteria and boundary. ERM CVS's responsibility is to provide conclusions on the agreed scope based on the assurance activities performed and exercising our professional judgement.

Our conclusions

Based on our activities, nothing has come to our attention to indicate that the corporate 2017 data for the selected GHG emissions as shown below and reported in section C6.1 and C6.3 of AptarGroup's 2018 CDP submission are not fairly presented, in all material respects, with the reporting criteria.

Scope 1 GHG emissions: 17,608 tCO₂e

Scope 2 GHG (location-based) emissions: 158,155 tCO₂e

Scope 2 GHG (market-based) emissions: 146,242 tCO₂e

Our assurance activities

Our objective was to assess whether the assured emission data are reported in accordance with the principles of completeness, comparability (across the organisation) and accuracy (including calculations, use of appropriate conversion factors and consolidation). We planned and performed our work to obtain all the information and explanations that we believe were necessary to provide a basis for our assurance conclusions. We applied a 5% material error threshold.

A multi-disciplinary team of EHS and assurance specialists performed the following activities:

- Interviews with relevant staff to understand and evaluate the data management systems and processes (including IT systems and internal review processes) used for collecting and reporting the selected data;
- Visits to four sites (Freyung, Germany; Ckyne, Czech Republic; Congers, NY; and Varela, Argentina) and four web-based visits (Annecy, France; Jundiai, Brazil; Suzhou, China; and Watertown, CT) to review local reporting processes and consistency of reported annual data with selected underlying source data for each

indicator. We interviewed relevant staff, reviewed site data capture and reporting methods, checked calculations, and assessed the local internal quality and assurance processes;

- An analytical review of the data from all sites and a check on the completeness and accuracy of the corporate data consolidation.

The limitations of our engagement

The reliability of the assured data is subject to inherent uncertainties, given the available methods for determining, calculating or estimating the underlying information. It is important to understand our assurance conclusions in this context.



Jennifer Iansen-Rogers
Head of Corporate Assurance Services
11 June 2018

ERM CVS
Informed Assured

ERM Certification and Verification Services, London
www.ermcvs.com; email: post@ermcvs.com