

R&R Teacher sheets chapter 8

Pg 129

Question 1 – Gather further evidence

- **Plastics:** Aim for 100% recyclable/reusable/compostable packaging; 57% achieved by 2024. Evidence may include pilot refill/reuse projects.
- **Emissions:** Partnerships (e.g. Walmart) to cut supply-chain emissions; net-zero ambition. Evidence may include renewable energy initiatives.
- **Livelihoods:** Regenerative agriculture on 1 million hectares → benefits for smallholder farmers; fair wages initiatives.

Question 2 – Are Unilever’s plans positive? Impacts on stakeholders

- **Employees & suppliers:** Benefit from long-term investment in regenerative agriculture and fairer supply-chain standards; more job security and training.
- **Government:** Positive impact through collaboration on climate targets; reduces national emissions burden.
- **Consumers:** Gain more sustainable products, trust in Unilever brands, but may face higher prices.
- **Investors:** See stronger brand reputation and risk management, but also large upfront costs and slower short-term returns.

Question 3 – Research critique

Possible student findings:

- Some media view it as genuine leadership (large financial commitment, measurable targets).
- Critics argue it could be “greenwashing” unless progress accelerates (e.g. still only 57% plastics recyclable by 2024).
- Tension between profit-making and sustainability investment.

Possible links to use/share:

<https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/resources/unilever-greenwash-investor-briefing/>

<https://edition.cnn.com/2023/12/12/business/unilever-cma-greenwashing-probe>

<https://www.dutchnews.nl/2025/06/unilever-accused-of-greenwashing-many-of-its-food-brands/>