



Assurance Statement for Innospec Inc: Sustainability Report 2025

Version: 1.1

Innospec Inc.

Assurance Statement for Innospec Inc: Sustainability Report 2025

Client name: Innospec Inc.

Version: 1.1

Date: 17 June 2026

Project manager: Jo Gradwell

Prepared by: Teleri Cousins

Document history and status

Version	Date	Description	Author	Checked	Reviewed	Approved
1.1	17/06/2026	Final	Teleri Cousins	Kat Ashdown	Jo Gradwell	Jo Gradwell

Jacobs U.K. Limited

The Lincoln, Lincoln Square
9 Brazenose Street
Manchester M2 5AD
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)161 235 6000
F +44 (0)161 235 6001
www.jacobs.com

© Copyright 2026 Jacobs U.K. Limited. All rights reserved. The content and information contained in this document are the property of the Jacobs group of companies ("Jacobs Group"). Publication, distribution, or reproduction of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs Group constitutes an infringement of copyright. Jacobs, the Jacobs logo, and all other Jacobs Group trademarks are the property of Jacobs Group.

NOTICE: This document has been prepared exclusively for the use and benefit of Jacobs Group client. Jacobs Group accepts no liability or responsibility for any use or reliance upon this document by any third party.

Assurance Statement

This statement is for the consideration of readers of Innospec Inc.'s ('Innospec') 2025 Sustainability Report, which could include Innospec's internal and external stakeholders.

Jacobs U.K. Limited ('Jacobs') was engaged to provide independent assurance of the 2025 Sustainability Report. The preparation of the report, including all reported data and content, was the responsibility of Innospec. Jacobs was responsible for undertaking the assurance engagement in line with the requirements of the assurance standard and the agreed scope, and for ensuring the competence of the assurance team.

The assurance engagement was undertaken between January and May 2026 by an assurance team based in the UK.

Scope of assurance

The assurance was undertaken in accordance with AccountAbility's AA1000 Assurance Standard v3 (AA1000AS) and followed the requirements of a Type 2 assurance, consisting of:

- An evaluation of Innospec's activities against the criteria of the four AA1000 AccountAbility Principles (2018) (AA1000 AP (2018)) of Inclusivity, Materiality, Responsiveness, and Impact.
- An evaluation of the reliability, quality and accuracy of the content of the 2025 Sustainability Report - the scope covered all statements, figures, and data within the report including the following environmental data:
 - Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Scope 1, Scope 2, and total Scope 3, with 2 selected categories, employee commuting and waste generated in operations, reviewed in detail),
 - Energy consumption,
 - Water consumption,
 - Waste generation.

The GHG Protocol Standard was considered during the review of relevant reported data.

Level of assurance and limitations

The assurance opinion within this statement is provided to a *Moderate* assurance level, as defined by AA1000AS v3. Although the risk of failing to detect errors or misstatements is greater than with a 'high' assurance engagement, the nature and extent of the evidence-gathering procedures undertaken for this *Moderate* assurance engagement were sufficient to provide a meaningful level of assurance.

While no significant limitations were encountered during evidence gathering, checks back to source for waste data were limited to a sample that had undergone internal validation.

The scope of the assurance covered the report in its entirety; however, although the scope 3 emissions total was assured, detailed back-to-source checks were undertaken for only two scope 3 categories: waste generated in operations and employee commuting. Given the potential complexity of scope 3 data, it is recommended that all scope 3 data be included in future assurance engagements.

Assurance methodology

The assurance process consisted of the following key steps:

- Reviewing the 2025 Sustainability Report content.
- Identifying material statements in the report.

- Selecting a sample of manufacturing sites and corporate functions for interview, based on the report's material content and previous years' assurance samples.
- Undertaking interviews with the selected sample, as well as the external consultant responsible for environmental data reporting. The details of the completed interviews are as follows:
 - Manufacturing sites: Ellesmere Port (UK), São Paulo (Brazil), Leuna (Germany), Midland (USA) and Castiglione (Italy).
 - Corporate Functions: Safety, Health and Environment (SHE), Regulatory Compliance, Product development, and two interviews with the Sustainability team; one covering all sustainability topics and the other focused specifically on palm oil and product carbon footprints.
 - External consultants: Jacobs – Environmental Team.
- Reviewing evidence to validate the material statements.
- Reviewing data collection, validation, and reporting processes.
- Reviewing a sample of the 2025 environmental data; up to 3 months of energy, water, and waste data was selected for the sample manufacturing sites. The review involved tracing data from primary evidence (e.g. utility bill) through to the reporting platform, and corporate level reports.
- Requesting amendments or corrections to the report content, where required, and producing a statement outlining findings and recommendations.

The evidence gathering and interviews provided an opportunity to assure both the disclosure (2025 Sustainability Report) and Innospec's adherence to the AA1000 AP (2018) by covering wider topics relating to systems, processes, and context.

A report to management will be provided, expanding on the recommendations presented in this statement.

Statement of Competence and Independence

Jacobs has a strong multidisciplinary assurance team with backgrounds in sustainability reporting and assurance, ESG due diligence and disclosure, and wider environmental management services.

The team was led by Teleri Cousins, an Associate-grade qualified Certified Sustainability Assurance Practitioner (CSAP). The assurance team has experience assuring corporate sustainability reports and environmental data for clients across a range of industries in the UK and globally. The team also has knowledge and experience of carbon and environmental data reporting standards.

The assurance team acted in accordance with the AA1000AS v3 Code of Practice, including those parts of the code relating to independence. The assurance practitioners were not involved in the preparation or writing of the 2025 Sustainability Report, nor any other relevant activities for Innospec. Consultants from Jacobs worked with Innospec on its environmental data validation and reporting and so to maintain the independence of the assurance process, the two Jacobs teams (assurance and data) comprised different employees and remained separate in terms of communications and knowledge sharing.

Findings relating to adherence to the AA1000AP (2018)

Based on our findings from the assurance process, the Jacobs assurance team concludes that Innospec adheres to the AA1000AP (2018) and examples of our findings are provided below.

Principle	Key findings
<p>Inclusivity</p> <p><i>People should have a say in the decisions that impact them</i></p>	<p>Innospec demonstrates stakeholder inclusivity through both formal and informal engagement mechanisms across its operations. The sample sites demonstrated a good awareness of corporate initiatives, and each had its own approach and examples of inclusivity. A materiality assessment was not completed in 2025, however, the focus areas for the business remain the same as those highlighted in the 2024 assessment.</p> <p>At a site level, there is evidence of employee participation being actively encouraged. For example, the Ellesmere Port site has expanded employee involvement in health and safety (H&S) by increasing the number of volunteer safety representatives; there are also mental health first aiders and Innospec Cares coordinators. The H&S volunteers receive training and act as conduits for feedback, with regular interaction between employees and the SHE (Safety, Health & Environment) team through this channel and during monthly 'shop floor' talks. Wellbeing initiatives can stem from employee requests or suggestions. All sample sites, apart from Brazil, were able to provide examples of such initiatives. The Brazilian site is Innospec's newest acquired site and is currently focused on integration in other areas.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement extends beyond employees, with all the sample sites referencing engagement with regulators and customers. Ellesmere Port's external engagement includes customer visits, school outreach, and STEM activities, while apprenticeship programmes at Leuna aim to support skills development. Innospec's activities in areas such as sustainable product developments, product carbon footprints, and sustainable palm oil reflect the priorities of their customers. Further insight into external stakeholder priorities is expected as an outcome of their Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), due for completion in 2026.</p> <p>At a corporate level, efforts are made to support inclusivity by translating key communications. For instance, corporate newsletters are translated into Portuguese for the Brazilian sites, and sites choose how to distribute and display this information. The Brazilian site shares the newsletter by email and uses site noticeboards. The rollout of Innospec Cares coordinators to cover all manufacturing sites and most office locations in 2025 further enhances global reach.</p> <p>Employee feedback mechanisms seemed to vary by site. While they do exist, they are largely informal (e.g. comments made during webinars and feedback passed on by volunteers), and there could be an opportunity to strengthen inclusivity through more formalised and consistent feedback collection. This is partly addressed through corporate surveys, however sites could also formalise their approach, beginning with the recording and analysis of feedback.</p>
<p>Materiality</p> <p><i>Decision makers should identify and be clear about the sustainability</i></p>	<p>Innospec shows clear understanding and identification of its material sustainability issues at both corporate and site levels. It last completed a Materiality Assessment in 2024, and the first phase of its DMA was completed in 2025. The topics identified as high importance to its stakeholders (as stated in the Sustainability Report) include process emissions, health and safety, product sustainability, ethical business, innovation, and economic and business performance. These material topics are aligned with the Innospec's activities in 2025, examples of which are provided below.</p>

<p><i>topics that matter</i></p>	<p>Across the company, health and safety (H&S) remains a primary material focus area. Corporate teams track key indicators such as Lost Time Accidents (LTAs), with continued emphasis on process safety, behavioural safety, PPE, and the “Journey to Zero Harm” programme. Examples of site-level alignment were provided during the sample site interviews, for example Midland’s focus on its material issues – H&S and loss of containment (LOC).</p> <p>The importance of environmental issues to Innospec was also demonstrated. During interviews, sites noted their key resource-intensive processes, such as steam usage at Ellesmere Port and Leuna, and their management of these. Investments in infrastructure, including new steam meters at Ellesmere Port and a steam trap replacement at Leuna, reflect targeted actions on material environmental impacts. Ellesmere Port’s transition to sourcing all its electricity from its combined heat and power (CHP) plant further illustrates alignment with energy-related material issues.</p> <p>Scope 3 emissions are the largest portion of Innospec’s total emissions, and its understanding of these improved in 2025 with the calculation of its Scope 3 emissions being completed in-house by the sustainability team.</p> <p>At a broader level, product impacts are considered. Product development is influenced by regulatory requirements and market demand, which can include requirements for lower impact products such as solid cosmetics reducing packaging and fuel additives supporting renewable fuels. Other focus areas for Innospec reflect their customers’ material topics including sustainable palm oil and developments in alternatives to animal testing.</p>
<p>Responsiveness</p> <p><i>Organisations should act transparently on material sustainability topics and their related impacts</i></p>	<p>As noted under the Materiality principle, Innospec’s focus areas in 2025 demonstrate that it has responded to the material topics.</p> <p>A number of the material topics are central to the roles of employees, such as those working in business development and product development. Two employees in these areas were interviewed and provided examples of how they respond to regulatory requirements and customer trends related to sustainability. New product developments have been communicated via Innospec’s website, as well as at conferences, and customer workshops. Other material topics, including H&S and process emissions, are addressed at both site and corporate levels. There continues to be senior management involvement in H&S decision-making through its quarterly ‘RESPECT’ committee, supported by structured and regular H&S and environment meetings and communications (e.g. best practice SHE meetings held biannually for all sites).</p> <p>Communication of environmental material topics at a site level varied across the sample sites. Some sites have well-established channels for communicating environmental messages and performance (e.g. emails, noticeboards and staff meetings), while others either rely solely on using corporate communications to relay key messages, or did not communicate on environmental topics in 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midland and São Paulo noted that the corporate newsletter serves as the primary channel for employee engagement on topics other than H&S. This approach may limit engagement with key sustainability topics or targets, as the newsletter’s objectives may not fully align with these. • Castiglione reported that it did not communicate its environmental performance to all employees.

	<p>It is recommended that guidance is provided to sites on how to communicate performance and material topics more effectively. This could align with the greater scope for feedback enabled by the new environmental data reporting system.</p> <p>In 2025/26, the company responded to the need for improved data management and transparency of its environmental data by implementing the Sphera reporting platform, replacing individual manual spreadsheets. Innospec continued to engage its consultant to calculate the environmental data in parallel with the new system to ensure accuracy and continuity. Transitioning to this platform should enable Innospec to respond more effectively to future reporting requirements. It also supported a smoother assurance process, with site-level records readily accessible on the platform.</p> <p>As noted in the limitations section of this statement, evidence for 2025 waste data was limited to the three months selected by Innospec for internal validation, and it was not possible to select an alternative sample for testing. Given the complexity and volume of waste data, the platform was tested in 2025 using three sample months. Going forward, from January 2026, sites will be required to upload waste data evidence for all months to the platform, which will make it available for future external assurance.</p>
<p>Impact</p> <p><i>Organisations should monitor, measure and be accountable for how their actions affect their broader ecosystems.</i></p>	<p>As noted under the Responsiveness principle above, Innospec’s measurement and reporting of site environmental data transitioned to a data reporting platform in 2025. Material site-level data is now uploaded to the Sphera platform, and Innospec aims to expand its use in 2026 to include dashboards and reporting.</p> <p>Access to source data files and increased transparency of site reporting should lead to improved data quality. For example, issues such as incorrect use of units and fuel types have been identified through the new system and internal validation processes. The findings from this assurance are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parallel use of reporting spreadsheets provided confirmation of the accuracy of the new system. Differences relating to emission factors were identified and corrected in Sphera. • Training was delivered to employees using the new system. • Clear roles are defined for each step of the data collection, validation, and reporting process. • The use of estimations is considered reasonable, and the basis for these were explained (e.g. estimating fuel usage based on tank size and deliveries). • Based on the sample of data traced back to source, the data recorded in the system is accurate. However, once the new reporting approach is fully established, a more in-depth review of the waste data is recommended. The largest destination category for hazardous waste is currently reported as 'other'. A review of waste destinations could either justify this classification or identify opportunities to reallocate data to more specific reporting categories. • No material issues were identified in the data recorded on the platform. <p>The calculations to produce the reported data were reviewed and no material issues were found. A small number of emission factors had not been updated; although the impact was not material, it is recommended that this is addressed in 2026. More consistent logging of reviews and updates to the 'Resource Dashboard' and version control, could reduce the risk of such issues.</p>

The assurance also covered two scope 3 categories: waste generated in operations and employee commuting, with no material errors were found. Non-material recommendations were made and addressed during the assurance process. It is recommended that the employee commuting source data is considered as an area for continuous improvement. Increasing the response rate to staff surveys would improve the data accuracy and developing a clear plan for 'next steps' would demonstrate accountability. The survey results could also inform a future emissions reduction strategy.

Innospec has an established process for checking data, and an internal validation log was reviewed, showing evidence of sample data checks. It is recommended that data queries with potentially material impacts are clearly flagged, and that more detailed explanations are obtained in such cases. Greater clarity on the scope and extent of internal checks would further strengthen the process, including defined expectations around sampling levels completed by sites and the internal validator, and the specific elements to be reviewed.

The reliability of the environmental reporting process would be enhanced by more comprehensive written procedures. While Innospec has an Environmental Reporting Standard, this does not fully document the processes followed by consultants to generate the final carbon and environmental performance data. Sites should also maintain detailed procedures outlining responsibilities and calculation methodologies. Sample sites provided examples of calculations (covering energy, water and waste data) that were not formally documented. Addressing this would improve transparency and reduce key reporting risks.

Findings relating to the reliability and quality of the Sustainability Report content

As set out in the methodology, evidence was reviewed for material statements in the report. Amendments to the content were requested where there were material differences from the source evidence, and a small number of wording changes were also suggested to improve transparency. All suggestions and required changes were actioned by Innospec and have been verified in the final report.

Innospec provided adequate source data and evidence for the sample of statements. While there was some reliance on internal records as evidence, external sources were provided where available. These documents were supported by interviews with key employees to corroborate the report content.

The content of the report is similar to previous Sustainability Reports and reflects Innospec's Materiality assessment. It is noted that the presentation of safety performance is an improvement on previous reports, with the inclusion of 2024 data for comparison enhancing transparency.

The report content is not primarily compliance-led or data focused, it provides details of a wide range of sustainability activities. This approach may be more impactful for some stakeholders. Whilst the content is wide ranging, it maintains balance by clearly communicating material topics, Innospec's strategy, KPIs and targets. Although there are no annual environmental targets, it is recommended that a minor change be made to the presentation of progress towards the 2034 environmental targets to improve transparency, for example by more clearly linking the percentage improvements to the target.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this assurance engagement, the Jacobs assurance team considers the following statements to be accurate:

- The 2025 Sustainability Report has been verified in full, and the information it presents is a fair reflection of Innospec's activities in 2025.
- To a *Moderate* level of assurance, all material aspects are deemed to be accurate.
- The Jacobs assurance team has identified no material concerns with the 2025 Sustainability Report.
- Innospec has demonstrated adherence to the AA1000 Accountability Principles of Inclusivity, Materiality, Responsiveness, and Impact.
- The systems and processes relating to data collation and reporting are considered to be fair and appropriate.

Jacobs U.K. Limited, Manchester, June 2026



AA1000
Licensed Assurance Provider
000-79



AA1000
Licensed Report
000-79/V3-4FZ12