

Independent Assurance Report



Independent Assurance Report

To the President and CEO of Mitsubishi Chemical Holdings Corporation

Purpose and Scope

We were engaged by Mitsubishi Chemical Holdings Corporation (the “Company”) to provide limited assurance on its KAITEKI Report 2013 MOS In-Depth Section (the “Report”) for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2013. The purpose of our assurance engagement was to express our conclusion, based on our assurance procedures, on whether the energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions and scope 3 emissions of Mitsubishi Chemical Holdings Corporation Group companies in Japan for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013 included in the Report (the “Indicators”) are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the Company’s reporting criteria.

The content of the Report is the responsibility of the Company’s management. Our responsibility is to carry out a limited assurance engagement and to express our conclusion based on the work performed.

Criteria

The Company applies its own reporting criteria as described in the Report. These are derived, among others, from the Act on the Rational Use of Energy, Act on Promotion of Global Warming Countermeasures, GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard and WBCSD Guidance for Accounting & Reporting Corporate GHG Emissions in the Chemical Sector Value Chain. We used these criteria to evaluate the Indicators.

Procedures Performed

We conducted our engagement in accordance with ‘International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000, Assurance Engagements other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information’ issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board, and the ‘Practical Guidelines for the Assurance of Sustainability Information’ of the Japanese Association of Assurance Organizations for Sustainability Information (“J-SUS”).

The limited assurance engagement on the Report consisted of making inquiries, primarily of persons responsible for the preparation of information presented in the Report, and applying analytical and other procedures. The level of assurance provided is thus not as high as that provided by a reasonable assurance engagement. Our assurance procedures included:

- Interviews with the Company’s responsible personnel to obtain an understanding of its policy for the preparation of the Report.
- Reviews of the Company’s reporting criteria.
- Inquiries about the design of the systems and methods used to collect and process the Indicators.
- Analytical reviews of the Indicators.
- Examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the generation, aggregation and reporting of the Indicators in conformity with the Company’s reporting criteria, and also a recalculation of the Indicators.
- Visit to Mitsubishi Chemical Corporation’s domestic factory selected on the basis of a risk analysis.
- Evaluating the overall statement in which the Indicators are expressed.

Conclusion

Based on the procedures performed, as described above, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that the Indicators in the Report are not prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the Company’s reporting criteria as described in the Report.

We have no conflict of interest relationships with the Company that are specified in the Code of Ethics of J-SUS.

KPMG AZSA Sustainability Co., Ltd.

KPMG AZSA Sustainability Co., Ltd.
Tokyo, Japan
October 15, 2013