C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios
☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Liability

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

☑ 2080

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions: • Strong global cooperation on climate; rapid deployment of renewables, storage, efficiency. • Carbon prices escalate quickly and uniformly. • Client industries (BFSI, TMT, Consumer, Manufacturing) adopt green procurement standards. • Zensar achieves its SBTi near-term and long-term targets. Uncertainties: • Speed and durability of political will in India, US, EU. • Renewable electricity tariff trends in India (may stay above grid short-term). •

How quickly suppliers decarbonize Scope 3 emissions. Constraints: • Capital allocation limits for RE procurement, data-center retrofits. • Data granularity gaps in India on flood/heat risk projections. • Dependence on local utilities' RE availability despite corporate demand.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Why relevant: This scenario aligns with Zensar's Net-Zero FY2045 SBTi commitment and near-term 2030 target. Rationale: By testing resilience under an orderly transition, Zensar can gauge the financial implications of high carbon prices, strict disclosure regimes (BRSR, IFRS S2), and client procurement standards in BFSI, TMT, and Consumer/Manufacturing verticals. It helps assess both cost exposure (higher RE tariffs in India vs grid) and opportunity upside (increased demand for cloud modernization, green IT, and security).

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 7.0

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical
☑ Market
☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 3.0ºC - 3.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2030
☑ 2050
☑ 2080

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

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

Finance and insurance
☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

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

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation
☑ Level of action (from local to global)
☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions: • Weak international cooperation; fragmented climate policy. • Continued reliance on fossil fuels in many economies. • India and South Africa experience rising heat and water stress. • Insurance markets become more risk-selective. Uncertainties: • How urban infrastructure (drainage, water supply) copes with escalating hazards. • Variability of consumer sentiment and procurement requirements in different geographies. • Extent of reputational damage if inequities in climate impacts are visible. Constraints: • Reduced access to affordable insurance in coastal/heat-stressed locations. • Limited quality of local ecosystem services (water, flood protection).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Why relevant: Zensar's delivery hubs in India and South Africa are highly exposed to heat, drought, and water stress, making this fragmented world particularly material. Rationale: This scenario highlights vulnerabilities where weak global coordination limits mitigation but intensifies local ecosystem degradation and physical risks. For Zensar, it underscores the importance of business continuity planning, insurance dependency, and H&S protocols, especially in Pune, Hyderabad, Bengaluru, and Cape Town.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Market

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

☑ 2080

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Number of ecosystems impacted

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions: • Global growth prioritizes fossil energy; limited early transition policy. • Physical risks dominate by mid-century (extreme heat, floods, cyclones). • Stakeholder and regulator action delayed until crises force change. Uncertainties: • Extent and timing of insurance market withdrawal from high-risk zones. • Severity of productivity losses under sustained extreme heat in India. • Migration and socio-political instability near delivery hubs. Constraints: • Dependence on public infrastructure resilience (roads, power grids). • Uncertainty in modelling compound extremes (heat + flood + drought).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Why relevant: A worst-case physical risk benchmark to stress-test Zensar's global footprint. Rationale: By assuming extreme warming, this scenario tests flood, cyclone, and heat-wave resilience at coastal campuses (Mumbai, Chennai, San Diego, Cape Town) and urban offices (Pune, Hyderabad, Bengaluru). It helps evaluate insurance availability, downtime costs, and adaptation CAPEX needs. Though less likely, it provides an upper-bound for physical risk disclosures.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Data regime (from closed to open)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions: • World achieves net-zero by 2050; rapid electrification and efficiency. •Carbon pricing is high and predictable; Scope 3 supply chains decarbonize. • RE costs continue to fall long-term despite current tariff differentials. • Strong global regulation, harmonized disclosure standards (IFRS S2). Uncertainties: • How smoothly global supply chains deliver RE, storage, and low-carbon tech. • Will Indian and South African grids keep pace with RE deployment needs. • Future customer willingness to pay premiums for "green IT" services. Constraints: • Higher short-term OPEX from RE procurement vs. grid electricity. • Dependence on effective supplier engagement to cut Scope 3. • Capital allocation trade-offs between transition investments and growth.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Why relevant: Represents the global policy pathway most consistent with Zensar's Net-Zero 2045 ambition. Rationale: This scenario enables Zensar to model the cost of transition (higher RE procurement, supplier engagement) against the opportunity to win business from clients prioritizing green IT. It helps justify RE investments despite current tariff differentials and demonstrates alignment with investor and client expectations.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA APS

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions: • Countries implement their announced climate pledges on time. • Carbon pricing exists but is uneven across regions. • RE penetration grows but not at NZE levels. Uncertainties: • Political changes may delay or weaken pledge implementation. • Gaps between targets and actual outcomes remain wide. • Client procurement requirements vary by geography (EU vs. US vs. India). Constraints: • Asymmetry in market opportunities: easier in EU/UK than in US/India. • Mid-sized suppliers in India may lack capacity to align with SBTi targets. • Zensar must manage uneven global compliance regimes.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Why relevant: Reflects a plausible middle path—countries deliver on announced pledges, but not full NZE. Rationale: For Zensar, this is useful for modelling uneven regulatory pressure (e.g., EU stricter, India slower), which will directly shape client procurement requirements and Scope 3 engagement. It highlights transitional challenges where clients in different regions move at different speeds, forcing operational and sales strategies to adapt accordingly.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation
☑ Sensitivity to inequity of nature impacts

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate
☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy
☑ Domestic growth
☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Assumptions: • Only policies already enacted are implemented. • RE growth continues but slower; fossil fuels remain in the mix. • Moderate warming (~2.4–2.7 °C) leads to both transition and physical risks. Uncertainties: • Long-term reliability of India's grid under rising demand and heat stress. • Client demand for decarbonized IT services rises slower than in APS/NZE. • Carbon prices remain modest and fragmented. Constraints: • Inertia in policy regimes slows adoption of mitigation measures. • Zensar's RE procurement limited by market mechanisms (availability, cost). • Physical adaptation costs rise gradually but may be underestimated.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Why relevant: Serves as the baseline planning case, closest to a "current trajectory." Rationale: STEPS helps Zensar benchmark against today's policy landscape—moderate transition pressures but rising physical risks after 2030. It reflects a world where carbon pricing remains modest, but physical disruptions (floods, heat, drought) begin to significantly impact delivery hubs. This provides a reference case for comparing resilience investments and ensures disclosures are grounded in a realistic baseline.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

India: Scenario narratives and key insights: • Transition: Under APS/NZE we expect stronger disclosure, procurement and energy-market requirements. This tightens expectations for renewable electricity, supplier decarbonization and data assurance. • Physical: Heat and intense rainfall increase materially by 2030 in BAU/PES, with riverine/pluvial flood disruption in several corridors and elevated coastal surge risk for Mumbai/Kolkata over the long term. • Economics: Our current benchmark is ₹8.36/kWh (grid) versus ₹9.02/kWh (renewable), a ₹0.66/kWh premium. Efficiency gains and an internal carbon price (ICP) make PPAs and green tariffs attractive under APS/NZE; battery-backed UPS reduces generator use and hardens continuity during heat/monsoon peaks. How this influences our business processes: • Risk & opportunities: Prioritize open-access/group-captive PPAs where efficiency + ICP to close the ₹0.66/kWh gap; elevate flood-exposed leases for finished-floor-level audits and landlord resilience. • Strategy & financial planning: Treat PPAs as hedges in APS/NZE cases. Model avoided outage costs when sizing battery storage. • Resilience of the business model: Dual-source power (on-site + open access), codified WFH triggers for red-alert rainfall/heat, and workload shifting to greener/safer cloud regions. • Capacity building: Procurement and facilities training on wheeling rules, roof rights and refrigerants; delivery teams trained on green cloud/finops. • Target setting & transition planning: India delivers on renewables to help achieve our global 70% RE by 2030 and FY2045 net-zero glidepath. South Africa: Scenario narratives and key insights: • Transition: Policy and assurance expectations rise under APS/NZE; energy-market reform enables wheeling/PPAs. • Physical: Moderate increases in windstorm and heavy-rain days; grid unreliability remains a near-term operational challenge. • Economics: Rooftop PV plus right-sized storage is both a decarbonization and reliability lever; the avoided-outage value strengthens business cases. How this influences our business processes: • Risk & opportunities: Screen buildings for PV/structural suitability; pre-qualify wheeling partners. • Strategy & financial planning: Expand long-tenor PPAs as markets mature. • Resilience of the business model: Load-shedding (critical-load mapping, flexible hours/remote work) and UPS optimization. • Capacity building: Electrical safety and battery O&M competency uplift. • Target setting & transition planning: Country pathway targets ≥60% RE by 2030, supporting global near-term SBTi goals. United Kingdom: Scenario narratives and key insights: • Transition: High expectations for disclosure and assurance under APS/NZE; growing client preference for 24/7 carbon-free energy over annual matching. • Physical: Moderate increases in heavy precipitation and windstorm disruption; acute physical risks are generally lower than in India. • Economics: Maintaining 100% RE via REGO-backed tariffs is achievable; EPC A/B spaces at lease events reduce energy intensity and regulatory risk. How this influences our business processes: • Risk & opportunities: Differentiate in RFPs that value green power. • Strategy & financial planning: Favor green-tariff renewables; invest selectively in sub-metering and controls rather than heavy capex. • Resilience of the business model: Targeted drainage/roof checks and wind/wet-weather BCP; refrigerant phase-down at equipment renewals. • Capacity building: Strengthen data/assurance literacy for ISSB/TCFD/CDP alignment. • Target setting & transition planning: Maintain 100% RE;

pilot 24/7 matching as markets/instruments mature. United States: Scenario narratives and key insights: • Transition: Broad availability of utility green tariffs and VPPAs; heightened liability/reputation exposure under APS/NZE (claims, assurance). • Physical: More frequent severe frontal storms and heavy rain in several regions; moderate coastal flood considerations for San Diego/Seattle. • Economics: A portfolio of green tariffs plus selective VPPAs accelerates renewable penetration; cloud region choice is a major lever for Scope 3. How this influences our business processes: • Risk & opportunities: Grow "green-by-design" delivery (cloud finops, data minimization) to meet client ESG asks. • Strategy & financial planning: Model VPPA hedge benefits alongside APS/NZE carbon price trajectories; fund data automation to ensure audit-ready evidence (tariff attestations, REC serials, cloud carbon data). • Resilience of the business model: BCP for wind/wet events; remote-work triggers; retro-commissioning to reduce intensity and improve comfort. • Capacity building: Legal/claims training for marketing/sales; architecture standards for carbon-aware cloud regioning. • Target setting & transition planning: Good possibility for ≥90% RE by 2030; 24/7 matching pilots with cloud providers.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

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

Zensar operates its headquarters out of India, which is a fossil dependent economy, still setting up coal and fossil based power generation plants. At this stage, it would be hard for us to commit to not having any facilities or value chain partners who will be completely independent of fossil based economy.

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

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

Zensar employs several mechanisms for collecting feedback on transition plans: 1.Stakeholder Engagement: Regular engagement with stakeholders including employees, customers, suppliers, and local communities to gather feedback and address environmental concerns. 2. Surveys and Questionnaires: Conducting surveys and questionnaires to collect data on stakeholder perceptions and inputs. 3. Grievance Redressal Mechanism: A formal grievance mechanism for stakeholders to report issues and receive timely responses. 4.Audits and Assessments: Regular GHG audits and assessments to identify areas for improvement and gather feedback.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ Annually

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

Policy & regulation Disclosure/assurance (ISSB/TCFD/BRSR/CDP) remains achievable; carbon pricing or energy codes do not make operations unviable; market claims rules (greenwashing) are clear. Market & clients Client ESG asks continue to favor low-carbon digital (cloud finops, data minimization, green UX); RFPs recognize RE procurement and credible targets. Real estate Ability to select or negotiate green-building spaces; refrigerant phase-down (spec R32/R454B) accepted; permission for rooftop/carport PV and EV chargers. Energy & certificates Green tariffs/PPAs/RECs remain credible and countable; prices do not spike beyond ICP-justified thresholds; 24/7 matching instruments mature. Technology & operations Equipment efficiency gains meet vendor specs; UPS right-sizing doesn't compromise resilience; batteries meet safety codes; cloud providers supply granular carbon data. Supply chain Tier-1 suppliers adopt SBTi and disclose RE%/emissions; data quality sufficient for Scope 3 tracking; logistics partners can supply activity/fuel data. People & change Adoption of virtual-first/travel policies; site-level heat/precipitation protocols (for H&S) accepted; ESG KRAs remain in leadership incentives. Finance Stable access to capex; FX and interest rates within planning bands; insurance terms do not materially worsen for rooftop PV/storage. Data, controls & assurance Metering and invoice data available; landlord data sharing; travel/expense and cloud usage data consistent; external assurance capacity available annually. Residuals Sufficient supply of high-quality removals near 2045 at forecast cost; no double counting; claims remain aligned to standards.

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

Net-zero commitment, governance & incentives SBTi-approved targets & net-zero roadmap (overall, near-term and long-term), and use of a company-specific scenario approach for climate analysis. Management KRAs tied to climate (CFO/CHRO/CSO/CRO KPIs include net-zero progress, renewable-energy share, compliance and ratings). Energy & emissions (mitigation) Renewable-energy acceleration to 54.3% of global energy in FY25 (up from 31.5% in FY24); goal 70% by 2030. Pune campus multi-pronged RE program (site contributes 56.9% of energy footprint): 350 kWp rooftop solar (generates ~516,701 kWh/year; ~370 tCO_2e avoided). 270 kWp solar carport (~350,000 kWh/year; ~250 tCO_2e avoided). Green power purchase of 1,561,131 kWh from MSEDCL in FY25. Data center & office upgrades (FY25) to cut energy/cooling loads: server/network refresh, cloud migration, UPS right-sizing/centralization, HVAC replacements (R22 → R407A), EC-fan retrofits, efficient pumps/leak detection, 100% LED + motion sensors. Reported outcomes include 2,856.8 GJ lower energy use and ₹2.9 Mn cost savings. Building Management Systems (BMS) with smart lighting, occupancy sensors, HVAC auto-timers; reported cost and emissions benefits. Site-level RE shares (examples): Pune 65%, Hyderabad 100%, Reading (UK) 100%, London 100%, Dallas Energy Star score 78. GHG performance: Scope 1+2 cut from 3,740.6 tCO_2e (FY23) to 1,857.9 tCO_2e (FY25); Scope 3 cut from 7,879.6 to 6,043.5 tCO_2e. Energy & environmental management systems ISO 14001:2015-certified EMS with internal audits and external assurance by Alcumus ISOQAR. No environmental non-compliances with fines/sanctions in FY25. Energy Management System aligned with ISO 50001:2018; ongoing emission monitoring systems. Green buildings & on-site renewables IGBC pre-certified new office at Shilpa Ananya Tech Park (Bengaluru) and 125 kWp rooftop solar investment (to supply >50% of site energy) plus STP, rainwater harvesting, and organic waste converters. Pune campus total solar capacity ~620 kWp with ~850,000 units/year generation; reported 1,088.1 tCO_2e/year avoided.

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

Integrated_Annual_Report_with_Notice-2024-25.pdf,Carbon-Reduction-Plan-2025.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Water stewardship (adaptation & efficiency) Integrated water management strategy (metering, recycling, groundwater recharge, efficient fixtures, NABL-tested quality). 150 KLD STP treated 8,259 kL in FY25 for reuse; 13 recharge pits with 6,309 kL capacity; drip irrigation; sensor taps/low-flow aerators. Measured outcomes (Pune): 25,743 kL recharge via open-area percolation; water intensity 0.4 kL/₹ Mn turnover. "Water positive" status for owned facilities in India (goal to certify) and zero-discharge target.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Client RFPs increasingly gate suppliers on renewable electricity, credible claims, and data quality. Scenario analysis and our FY2045 net-zero pathway have re-pointed our services strategy around three ideas: 1. Productize "green-by-design" delivery (so clients buy lower-emission outcomes). 2. Make our delivery footprint measurably low-carbon and resilient (so we qualify for RFPs and deliver through climate shocks). 3. Be audit-ready (so claims about "green" delivery withstand rising assurance and liability standards). Climate risk has reshaped our services from the inside out: we sell measurable abatement and resilience, we

deliver on low-carbon infrastructure backed by evidence, and we structure contracts and data so our claims stand up to scrutiny. That combination—credible green delivery + resilient execution + audit-ready data—is now a core competitive edge for Zensar in every country where we operate.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Upstream (suppliers, landlords, utilities, cloud, travel/logistics): • Prioritize low carbon suppliers: Collect progress on decarbonization commitments from suppliers, track progress and develop a low carbon supplier base. • Green power availability: Hedge with a portfolio (on-site PV/storage, PPAs, green tariffs, time-bound EACs) and lock roof rights/sub-metering/refrigerant terms in leases. • Claims/liability & assurance burden: Require attestations (PPA/tariff/REC serials, cloud carbon data), and integrate evidence capture into contracts. • Preferred-partner stack: Prioritize cloud/OEMs with high RE% and 24/7 roadmaps to shorten client due diligence and boost win-rates. • Green finance & incentives: Screen capex for country incentives; standardize documents to qualify. Downstream (clients, delivery, markets) • Client ESG gating & market access: RFPs demand credible RE, 24/7 matching, and audit-ready data. we productize "green-by-design" delivery (cloud finops, carbon-aware regioning, data minimization). • Assurance & liability: Legal sign-off on sustainability marketing, conservative wording, and an evidence system built into delivery database. •Physical disruption to delivery: Codified remote-work triggers, workload shifting to greener/safer cloud regions, and UPS/storage at offices. • Revenue mix shift: Sell measurable abatement—Green Cloud & FinOps, ESG data/assurance, sustainable product engineering/UX. • Commercial hedges: PPAs/VPPAs and green tariffs stabilize our cost base, letting us offer multi-year pricing with carbon attributes. • Brand & talent: Verified progress (RE, SBTi) strengthens employer brand and differentiates in ESG-scored bids.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

We’re shifting R&D from “feature velocity” to “measurable efficiency, resilience, and audit-ready sustainability” so our software, data, and cloud solutions win ESG-gated deals and stand up to assurance. Client ESG gating & market access: We productize abatement patterns that reduce compute/storage/network. Data quality burden: Common data pipelines and connectors (utilities, codes, cloud telemetry) reused across client programs. Green Cloud & FinOps kit: SDKs for energy efficient scheduling/regioning, autoscaling heuristics that trade latency/cost. Data Minimization & Sustainable Engineering: Patterns to cut payloads, requests, and retention; browser/app performance budgets tied to efficiency; model-size reduction for AI/ML. Resilience Toolkit: Triggers to switch delivery modes with redundant servers; QoS adaptation; office–cloud coordination (e.g., deferrable jobs when outages loom).

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Scope 1 (Minor but not zero): • Replace/retire diesel gensets with battery-backed UPS; where generators remain, trial B5–B20 biodiesel. • Refrigerants: phase out high-GWP gases at lease renewals/equipment swaps; specify R32/R454B class as preferred and implement tight leak-detection program. Scope 2 (largest controllable lever): • Efficiency: BMS implementation everywhere; server/network refresh with efficient equipment; right-size UPS for all facilities; EC-fans & VFDs in place of aging fans and motors; all-LED lighting. • Renewables: Rooftop Solar, open-access/group-captive PPAs. • Load shaping: shift compute to greener hours/regions for electricity intensive infra; use of hybrid work arrangements. Scope 3 (client-facing and supply-chain heavy): • Cloud & DC: Prefer hyperscalers

with 24/7 carbon-free energy roadmaps; include Supplier RE% and Power Usage Effectiveness in selection. • Purchased goods: Require top-tier IT suppliers to set SBTi targets; scorecards in sourcing; specification for energy-efficient kit. • Leased spaces: Selection of leased spaces based on carbon performance; preference to Green buildings. • Business travel & commuting: "avoid/shift/improve"—virtual-first approach to travel, rail-over-air where feasible, EV-first ground transport; site-level commute plans. • Client work: grow low-carbon digital services (finops for cloud, data minimization, green UX). Finance & governance • Internal carbon price (ICP) applied to procurement and project gating; escalate ICP by scenario. • Linked incentives: KRAs for RE share, energy-intensity, supplier SBTi coverage, audit-clean ESG data, and ratings. • Controls: ISO 14001 EMS + continuous audits; a climate risk register (COSO style) maintained quarterly. • Evidence for assurance: meter photos, invoices, PPA attestations, certificate serials, travel/expense extracts, cloud usage & region mix. People & change • Country ESG Champions in Facilities, Procurement, Finance, HR, and Delivery. • Training: Energy literacy, green coding/finops, supplier engagement. • Just Transition: Thermal-comfort & H&S for high-heat days, remote-work triggers from HR during extreme rain/wind.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Assets
☑ Revenues
☑ Direct costs
☑ Indirect costs
☑ Access to capital
☑ Capital allocation
☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Revenues • Positive mix shift: Client RFPs increasingly gate suppliers on credible renewable electricity, evidence-ready data and low-carbon delivery. Our green-by-design strategy is lifting win-rates and revenue share from these services, especially in the US/UK. Direct costs (energy, facilities, delivery) • Electricity & fuel: In India today renewables carry a ₹0.66/kWh premium (₹9.02 vs ₹8.36 grid). We are offsetting this via efficiency (BMS/HVAC/UPS/LED. In South Africa, PV+storage cuts DG use and outage losses, reducing total delivery cost. • Travel & logistics: Virtual-first delivery and rail-over-air policies reduce travel opex; EV-first ground transport in key cities lowers fuel and maintenance costs. Indirect costs (compliance, data, liability) • Assurance & reporting: Stronger regimes (APS/NZE) raise assurance, controls, and data-engineering costs. We've embedded evidence systems (PPAs/green tariffs, meters) to keep audit exceptions at zero and avoid penalty risk. • Claims & legal: Tighter governance (US/UK focus) adds a modest review cost but mitigates litigation/reputation exposure. Capex (what we're funding) • Efficiency first: Portfolio of retro-commissioning and upgrades (BMS, HVAC right-sizing, EC-fans, LEDs, UPS optimization) with 2–4 year paybacks. • On-site renewables & storage: Rooftop/carport solar and batteries at priority offices (India, South Africa) to cut opex. Capital allocation (how budgets shift) • From discretionary to abatement: Higher share to efficiency + RE procurement. • Cloud & vendors: Preference to providers with decarbonization plans to reduce Scope-3 risk and speed sales due-diligence. Access to capital (financing conditions) •Improved eligibility: Verified progress on SBTi targets, rising RE share, and assurance-ready reporting support sustainability-linked financing and access to green instruments. • Ratings linkage: ESG ratings like CDP influence margins; our ratings action plan (RE %, Scope progress, audit-ready data) is aimed at protecting spreads. Assets (what we own/lease and how we use it) • Real estate quality: We prioritize EPC A/B & IGBC-ready spaces and lease riders for RE, low-GWP refrigerants, and EV charging—reducing energy intensity and compliance risk. • Generation & storage assets: Rooftop/carport PV and batteries add resilient capacity; assets are sized right to cut diesel reliance. • Digital assets: R&D produces reusable IP. These intangibles enable premium services and faster delivery.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Environmental CAPEX and OPEX have been systemized under our accounting system wherein Climate/Energy related projects are separately available

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

14379200

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

3.9

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

16.65

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

15

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

All Environment related CAPEX and OPEX are part of the annual budget of the facilities division of Zensar and climate/Energy related CAPEX and OPEX projects are systematically evaluated for their TCO2 reduction impact, investment, payback, savings etc. by the facilities team.

Row 2

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Environmental CAPEX and OPEX have been systemized under our accounting system wherein Climate/Energy related projects are separately available

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

17954402

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

0.24

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

0.26

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

0.35

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition

All Environment related CAPEX and OPEX are part of the annual budget of the facilities division of Zensar and climate/Energy related CAPEX and OPEX projects are systematically evaluated for their TCO2 reduction impact, investment, payback, savings etc. by the facilities team.

[Add row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Carbon

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon.

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive energy efficiency

☑ Drive low-carbon investment

☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to scientific guidance
☑ Benchmarking against peers
☑ Scenario analysis

(5.10.1.4) Calculation methodology and assumptions made in determining the price

The selected carbon prices are based off of IEA NZE and IEA APS projections for Emerging economies with globally declared targets. We have selected the average value between APS and NZE scenarios, converted them to INR and rounded them off to the nearest x1000 INR for simplicity of application.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:
☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:
☑ Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

We set the prices for three temporal ranges as per IEA scenarios data availability- Now to 2030, 2031 to 2040 and 2041 to 2050. As our operations majorly lie in emerging economies with globally declared targets, we have chosen the prices that lie between APS and NZE pathways.

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

6000

(5.10.1.11) Maximum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

15000

(5.10.1.12) Business decision-making processes the internal price is applied to

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Risk management

☑ Opportunity management

(5.10.1.13) Internal price is mandatory within business decision-making processes

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some decision-making processes, please specify :Carbon price is applied to processes where carbon reduction calculations are possible and carbon price can have an impact.

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

25

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

We monitor the pricing scheme every year aligned to latest data updates under IEA scenarios, to ensure the prices remain relevant. The prices are approved by the CSO before application every year.
[Add row]