

Appendix 1: Applied methodologies

Basis for preparation

This Sustainability Report 2025 is our Report on Non-Financial Matters for the financial year from January 1 to December 31, 2025. This report was published on May 22, 2026. It is intended to provide stakeholders with a structured view of the company's most material ESG topics; the associated impacts, risks, and opportunities; and the progress made toward Interroll's long-term sustainability ambitions.

Reporting period and scope

The reporting period covers the 2025 financial year, with comparative information from previous periods presented where available. The reporting entity comprises Interroll Holding AG and all entities under its operational control, consistent with the consolidation approach used in the Interroll Annual Report 2025, page 75. The sustainability reporting boundary follows the operational control principle in line with the GHG Protocol and relevant reporting standards, meaning that all operations over which Interroll exercises operational control are included.

Certain activities are temporarily excluded from the 2025 reporting scope:

- Interroll India Private Limited, India: acquired in 2024, is excluded due to ongoing post-merger integration and immature ESG data and processes; inclusion is planned for the Sustainability Report 2026.
- Due to their small size (fewer than ten employees each) and non-material impact on the Group's overall sustainability performance:
 - Interroll (Schweiz) AG, Switzerland
 - Interroll Europe BV, Netherlands
 - Interroll Lojistik Sistemleri, Turkey
 - Interroll USA Holding LLC, United States of America
 - Interroll Mexico S. de R.L. de C.V., Mexico
 - Interroll Japan Co. Ltd., Japan
 - Sortteq B.V., Netherlands

These exclusions do not materially affect the overall understanding of Interroll's sustainability-related impacts, risks, and opportunities.

Reporting frameworks and standards

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards and with reference to the following regulatory and reporting frameworks:

- Article 964b of the Swiss Code of Obligations (non-financial reporting requirements)
- GRI Standards, applied as the primary sustainability reporting framework
- IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standard S2 on climate-related disclosures
- UN Global Compact Communication on Progress, including alignment with the SDGs

Where applicable, cross-references to GRI disclosures, IFRS S2 requirements, and provisions of the Swiss Code of Obligations are provided in the respective appendices of this report.

Sustainability-related information is prepared using the same internal control principles as financial reporting, with a focus on consistency, traceability, and decision usefulness. In 2025, Interroll further improved its data and methodology by implementing centralized ESG data collection tools and enhanced carbon accounting solutions. Selected prior-year figures have been restated to reflect these methodological improvements rather than changes in underlying performance.

This report has not been subject to external assurance.

Double materiality assessment approach

Step 1 – Context and value chain analysis

We first established a common analytical baseline for the DMA.

Business model and value chain

The value chain was mapped from upstream raw materials and components, through our own manufacturing and logistics, to downstream system integrators, OEM customers, and the end-use and end-of-life of our products.

Strategic and operating context

Strategic objectives were reviewed against key regulatory, technological, and market developments in our main regions and industries, including logistics, e-commerce, airports, and manufacturing.

Stakeholder mapping

Key stakeholder groups were identified, including employees, customers, suppliers, investors, regulators, and local communities, together with their likely sustainability priorities and information needs.

This context analysis ensured that the DMA reflects our current business model, risk profile, and stakeholder landscape.

Step 2 – Long list of ESRS topics

All 94 ESRS environmental, social, and governance subtopics were screened for both impact and financial materiality using a structured scoring framework.

Impact materiality criteria

Scale, scope, irremediability, and likelihood of potential or actual impacts along the value chain.

Financial materiality criteria

Magnitude and likelihood of potential effects on Interroll's financial position and performance.

Internal experts from relevant functions (e.g., sustainability, risk, operations, HR, procurement) reviewed and validated the preliminary scoring. As a result, topics that clearly fell outside our impact and risk profile were removed from the long-list.

Step 3 – Shortlist and impact-risk-opportunity descriptions

The remaining subtopics were then consolidated into a manageable shortlist of topic clusters.

Topic aggregation

Conceptually related subtopics (such as resource efficiency and circularity) were grouped into broader topics (e.g., chapter *Sustainable Innovation*, on page 69).

Benchmarking

The aggregation logic was cross-checked against peers and external frameworks, including GRI, ISSB, and external ESG ratings, to ensure comparability and completeness.

Impact-risk-opportunity (IRO) descriptions

For each shortlisted topic, we prepared a concise description of:

- Relevant activities and value-chain stages
- Potential positive and negative impacts on people and the environment
- Material risks and opportunities for Interroll's business model and financial performance

These IRO descriptions were reviewed by external academic experts to strengthen methodological robustness and clarity.

Step 4 – Stakeholder and management input

We then collected quantitative and qualitative input on the shortlisted topics from stakeholders and management.

Impact materiality survey

A survey was sent to a broad group of internal and external stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, and investors. Respondents were asked to rate the significance of each topic based on perceived impacts on people and the environment, and to provide qualitative comments where relevant.

Financial materiality survey

A tailored survey was conducted with members of management, focusing on the potential financial effects of each topic, such as impact on revenues, costs, capital expenditures, or access to financing.

Qualitative feedback

Open text responses were reviewed and used to refine topic descriptions, identify blind spots, and better understand regional or stakeholder-specific nuances.

This dual survey approach ensured that both impact and financial perspectives were captured in a consistent and transparent way.

Step 5 – Analysis, consolidation, and workshops

Survey results, expert assessments, and contextual information were combined to determine the preliminary positioning of each topic along the two materiality dimensions.

Scoring consolidation

Quantitative scores from stakeholder and management surveys were combined with expert judgment to avoid over- or underweighting individual respondent groups.

Management workshop

Our Group Management reviewed the preliminary materiality outcomes in dedicated workshops. The discussion focused on:

- Alignment with the corporate strategy and risk management framework
- Coherence with the ESG Risk Catalogue
- Potential future developments (e.g., regulatory changes, customer expectations)

Where needed, Group Management adjusted topic positions to reflect strategic relevance and emerging risks or opportunities.

Step 6 – 2025 refinement and alignment with ESG risk management

In 2025, we refined the DMA to ensure full alignment with its updated ESG risk management methodology and our new Sustainability Framework.

The refinement addressed three main methodological challenges:

Aggregation levels

Harmonizing the topic aggregation used in the stakeholder survey with the more granular ESG Risk Catalogue.

Financial thresholds

Aligning the financial materiality thresholds (e.g., revenue or cost impact levels) used in the DMA with those applied in the broader risk management methodology.

Scoring logic

Adjusting the definitions and calculation methods for scale, scope, likelihood, and irremediability in order to ensure consistency between the DMA and the ESG risk assessment.

The refinement led to a more coherent link between the material topics, the ESG Risk Catalogue, and the risk management framework. The final materiality positions therefore reflect both stakeholder perspectives and our internal risk assessment.

Step 7 – Board approval and link to strategy

The final set of material topics, was presented to the Board of Directors for review and approval on December 17, 2025. The Board considered:

- The relevance of each topic for our long-term competitiveness and resilience
- The alignment with the Interroll Sustainability Framework (People, Planet, Product)
- The implications for strategic priorities, targets, and resource allocation

Each material topic is addressed in a dedicated section of this report, which explains:

- Why the topic is material for Interroll
- How it is governed and managed
- Key policies, actions, and targets
- Selected quantitative and qualitative performance indicators

The DMA will be reviewed regularly to reflect changes in our business model, regulatory environment, stakeholder expectations, and ESG risk profile.

ESR risk management

Integration and principles

ESG risk management is integrated into our overall risk management and the Integrated Management System using common methodologies and thresholds to ensure consistency across financial and non-financial risks. It is guided by four core principles:

- Clear responsibilities: Roles and accountabilities follow the Three Lines of Defense model
- Holistic coverage: ESG risks are identified and assessed at both strategic and operational levels, across all relevant entities, functions, and value-chain stages
- Standardized methods: Interroll uses harmonized criteria, scales, and tools to assess ESG risks, enabling comparability and aggregation across topics and locations
- Risk appetite-based steering: A defined ESG risk appetite sets the level and type of risks Interroll is willing to accept and provides guardrails for escalation and mitigation decisions

Identification of ESG risks

ESG risks are identified through both scheduled and event-driven processes.

- Scheduled identification: At least once per year, Interroll updates its ESG risk landscape and ESG Risk Catalogue to maintain an up-to-date overview of material ESG risks across operations, products, and business relationships. This inventory reflects internal developments and external changes in regulation, markets, and stakeholder expectations.
- Event-driven identification: Additional identification and reassessment are triggered by specific events, such as major acquisitions, changes in the business model, or new/updated regulations. In such cases, the existing risk landscape and residual risks are reviewed, and the acceptable risk level may be adjusted or a full or partial reassessment conducted.

The ESG Risk Catalogue serves as the central repository for identified risks, underlying assumptions, and assessment parameters, and is maintained by the central first-line sustainability function with oversight from Corporate Integrity.

Assessment of ESG risks

ESG risks are assessed in a two-step process using common financial impact and likelihood scales, typically from 1 (low) to 5 (high), aligned with Group EBIT thresholds and established risk methodologies.

Pre-assessment

After identification, risks undergo an initial pre-assessment based on standardized criteria such as potential financial impact, location of materialization, and type of impact. This pre-assessment, performed centrally by Corporate Sustainability and approved by Corporate Integrity, provides an initial risk score and helps identify "focus risks" that require deeper analysis.

Detailed assessment

Focus risks are then subjected to a detailed assessment that applies more granular financial impact categories and scenario-based evaluations. The objective is to quantify potential consequences with greater precision. In this way, we support the design of targeted mitigation strategies for risks that could have significant adverse effects on our performance or resilience.

Likelihood of risk occurrence within 12 months

Score	Likelihood of occurrence
1 - very unlikely	<10%
2 - unlikely	<25%
3 - moderate	<50%
4 - likely	<75%
5 - very likely	<100%

Financial impact on Group EBIT if risk occurs

Score	Financial impact
1 - negligible	<1%
2 - minor	1% to <10%
3 - moderate	10% to <30%
4 - severe	30% to <50%
5 - catastrophic	>50%

This staged approach balances robustness with efficiency by concentrating more detailed work on the most material ESG risks.

Steering of ESG risks

Risk steering and monitoring are carried out within a defined ESG risk appetite framework that sets clear thresholds for acceptable, tolerable, and unacceptable ESG risks.

Risk categories and thresholds

Based on their assessed financial impact and likelihood, ESG risks are categorized into low, medium, high, or very high. Low risks fall within our risk appetite and may be accepted without additional measures, while medium to very high risks require defined mitigation, monitoring, and, where applicable, escalation.

Negative List

Certain ESG risks, such as specific types of human rights violations, severe environmental damage, or corruption, are classified on a "Negative List." They are fundamentally outside Interroll's risk appetite, regardless of their quantitative score. These risks are always treated as very high and must be mitigated, with measures validated and approved at the highest escalation level, typically by Group Management. The ESG Risk Catalogue includes a function to flag such risks and override automated scoring in line with the governance rules.

Impact	Catastrophic	Medium Risk	High Risk	Very High Risk	Very High Risk	Very High Risk
	Severe	Medium Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	Very High Risk	Very High Risk
	Moderate	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	High Risk	Very High Risk
	Minor	Low Risk	Low Risk	Medium Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk
	Negligible	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Medium Risk	Medium Risk
Impact / Likelihood	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Moderate	Likely	Very Likely	
	Likelihood					

This combination of quantitative thresholds and qualitative exclusions ensures that strategically unacceptable risks cannot be inadvertently tolerated.

Reporting of ESG risks

ESG risks are monitored and reported through standardized risk catalogues and governance-defined reporting lines.

Monitoring cadence

Monitoring frequency depends on the risk category, with higher-rated and negative-list risks subject to more frequent review and escalation. Monitoring covers both the evolution of risk drivers and the effectiveness of mitigation measures.

Reporting and escalation

Once assessments are completed and steering measures agreed, the relevant risk catalogues are submitted to designated stakeholders at site, functional, and Group level, and approvals are documented within the catalogue. At the end of each cycle, a consolidated and aggregated ESG Risk Catalogue forms the basis for ESG risk reporting to Group Management, the Sustainability Committee, and the Board of Directors, in line with the overall risk governance described in this section.

The ESG risk management framework is reviewed regularly by Corporate Integrity and updated as necessary to reflect organizational changes, regulatory developments, and lessons learned from implementation, ensuring that ESG risks continue to be managed with the same rigor as financial and operational risks.