Independent Third Party Assurance Statement

To the Board and stakeholders of The Mosaic Company:
iCompli Sustainability, a division of BPA Worldwide, was commissioned by The Mosaic Company (‘Mosaic’) to provide independent third party assurance over the sustainability content within the 2015 Sustainability Report (the ‘Report’, covering activities occurring primarily from January 1, 2015, to December 31, 2015).

AccountAbility AA1000AS (revised, 2008)
This engagement has been managed in accordance with AccountAbility’s AA1000AS (2008) assurance standard, where the format of the engagement was structured to meet the AA1000AS Type I (Moderate) requirements.

Independence
iCompli Sustainability has not been responsible for the preparation of any part of the Report, nor have we undertaken any commissions that would conflict with our independence. Responsibility for producing the Report belonged to Mosaic and its sustainability reporting advisors. Thus iCompli Sustainability is, and remains, an independent assurer over the content and processes pertaining to the Report.

Assurance Objectives
The objective of the assurance process was to provide Mosaic’s stakeholders an independent ‘moderate level assurance’ opinion on whether:

- The sustainability content within Mosaic’s Report adheres to the AA1000AS (2008) principles of Inclusivity, Materiality and Responsiveness; and,
- The sustainability content within the Report meets reasonable expectations for report content, including whether or not the Report meets the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) G4 Mining and Metals Sector Disclosures ‘In accordance – Core’ reporting requirements.

Assurance Approach and Limitations
The process used in arriving at this assurance statement is based on AccountAbility’s AA1000AS (2008) guidance, the GRI G4 Mining and Metals Sector Disclosures requirements, as well as other best practices in sustainability reporting assurance. Our approach to assurance included:

- Examination of the procedures Mosaic uses to define the material issues included in the Report.
- A review of the information and data management reporting process undertaken by Mosaic, to determine the quality and credibility of the information presented.
- Interviews with staff responsible for the determination of sustainability context and coverage of material issues.
- A review of drafts of the Report for any significant errors and/or anomalies within stated assertions, and to confirm whether or not it contains the requisite number of GRI G4 Mining and Metals Sector Disclosures indicators to meet the GRI ‘In accordance – Core’ reporting requirements.

The assurance process was limited to the content and assertions made within Mosaic’s Report for the period under review, and did not extend to a comprehensive analysis of the accuracy, reliability, completeness and/or consistency of the data presented by Mosaic. Rather, data presented within the Report was subjected only to a series of reasonability tests during proof editing. The process was further limited to reviewing policies and procedures for ethics, governance and stakeholder engagements, and did not extend to the engagement of any external stakeholders to arrive at our assurance opinion.
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Findings
Based on our review of the Report, as well as the processes employed to collect and collate information reported herein, it is our assertion that:

- Mosaic reasonably adheres to the AccountAbility AA1000APS principles of Inclusivity, Materiality and Responsiveness; and,
- The Report adequately meets the GRI G4 Mining and Metals Sector Disclosures ‘In accordance – Core’ reporting requirements.

Based on the information reviewed and interviews conducted, iCompli Sustainability is confident that the Report provides a reasonable account of Mosaic’s sustainability performance for the period under review.

Recommendations
The following recommendations have been identified to improve the Report:

- With respect to the principle of Inclusivity, Mosaic should continue to expand engagement with entities and suppliers that it impacts but does not have operational control.
- With respect to the principle of Materiality, Mosaic should continue to integrate the processes for identifying material topics between operational, financial and sustainability perspectives.
- With respect to the principle of Responsiveness, Mosaic should continue to evaluate emerging sustainability frameworks and stakeholder information needs.

For more information about the assurance process employed to assess the sustainability information contained within Mosaic’s Report, contact icomplisustainability.com.

May 31, 2016
iCompli Sustainability, a division of BPA Worldwide
100 Beard Sawmill Road, 6th Floor Shelton, CT 06484
Trucost was engaged by **The Mosaic Company** to provide assurance of its 2016 CDP submission and Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) report.

### Intended Users

The intended users of this assurance statement are the management and stakeholders of Mosaic.

### Responsibilities of Mosaic and Assurance Provider

The management of Mosaic has sole responsibility for the preparation and content of its CDP submission and GRI report. Trucost's statement represents its independent and balanced opinion on the content and accuracy of the information and environmental data held within.

### Assurance Standard

Trucost undertook the review in accordance with AA1000AS (2008) Type 2 moderate-level assurance, covering:

- The reliability of environmental performance data.
- Trucost used the GRI principles and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol to evaluate Mosaic’s performance information and adherence to the Principles.

### Scope

Trucost was engaged to assure the data and claims relating to Mosaic’s 2016 CDP submission and GRI report, covering the period January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015. Mosaic took an operational control approach. Trucost verified the following environmental impacts and resource use (as calculated by Mosaic).

### Description of Methodology

Trucost's methodology included the following activities:

- Review of the processes by which Mosaic defines the sustainability issues that are relevant and material to its operations and its stakeholders
- Interviews with employees responsible for data collection and drafting CDP response and GRI report
- Assessment of the extent to which Mosaic’s CDP response adhere to the Principles
- Limited assessment of evidence provided to support key claims in the CDP response and GRI report
- Review of processes and systems used to gather and consolidate environmental data
- Verification of data accuracy for a selection of sites, including an audit of conversion factors and calculations

---

1. “Other” disposal method includes combinations of co-processing, retort, treatment, incineration and/or deep well injection.

---

### Table 1: EN15 (Scope 1), EN16 (Scope 2) and EN17 (Scope 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas Emission Source</th>
<th>Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope 1</strong></td>
<td>Natural gas, diesel, gasoline, propane, fuel oil, NH₃, limestone, phosphate rock and process-related emissions</td>
<td>2,960,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope 2</strong></td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>1,823,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope 3</strong></td>
<td>Ammonia purchases</td>
<td>2,231,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road transport of phosphate rock (Florida)</td>
<td>15,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road transport of finished products &amp; process chemicals (Florida)</td>
<td>14,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marine transport</td>
<td>197,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rail transport (Florida)</td>
<td>12,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business travel-air</td>
<td>4,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 2: EN 3 and EN4 – Energy consumption within and outside the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Source</th>
<th>Consumption (GJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam from captured heat</td>
<td>59,325,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogenerated electricity</td>
<td>6,388,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td>28,939,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum products</td>
<td>1,584,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity purchased from utilities</td>
<td>10,508,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>106,746,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 3: EN8 - Total water withdrawn by source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Consumption (m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>68,270,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal water</td>
<td>729,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>224,168,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclaimed wastewater</td>
<td>7,514,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>300,682,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table 4: EN 23 - Waste generated by disposal method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Disposal</th>
<th>Hazardous (metric tons)</th>
<th>Non-hazardous (metric tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incineration</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>15,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other¹</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycle</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,508</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. **Other** disposal method includes combinations of co-processing, retort, treatment, incineration and/or deep well injection.
Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The Principles: Nothing came to Trucost’s attention to suggest that Mosaic’s CDP response and GRI report do not adhere to the AA1000AS Principles.

Data reliability: Trucost did not find evidence to insinuate that the processes and systems to collect and collate data are such that the company’s environmental performance would be erroneously described. All minor corrections were made as necessary.

Mosaic uses a third party software system to collect data and make calculations at an environmental impact level. Mosaic applied the most up-to-date conversion factors. Trucost assured the raw data based on the invoices that Mosaic provided.

Trucost recommends that Mosaic continue to review and update emission factors annually or as available. Trucost also recommends that Mosaic compile an Inventory Management Plan to record the methodologies and assumptions that it applies in its calculations.

Trucost recommends that Mosaic consistently collect and record environmental impacts and resource use to minimize errors in measurement and reporting. Currently, Mosaic’s data collection practices vary by facility. For example, Mosaic sites should enhance their tracking of purchases and consumption of fuels (gasoline, diesel and propane), and use well-defined units. Mosaic also should improve its replication of facility data into summary spreadsheets to increase overall data quality. For example, Mosaic should translate waste data into English for sites outside the U.S. to help ensure that impacts are being recorded correctly. Trucost recommends that Mosaic work with its facility managers to improve their tracking of environmental impacts across all categories to facilitate corporate reporting in the future.

Finally, Trucost recommends that Mosaic include calculation formulas in its spreadsheets, rather than only the final values, to minimize conversion errors. Integrating the formulas would clarify how data are used, how emission factors are applied and how unit conversions are made.

Assurance Provider

Trucost has been researching, standardizing and validating corporate environmental performance data since 2000. Trucost’s research team has the relevant professional and technical competencies and experience to conduct an assurance to the AA1000 standard. Trucost did not provide any services to Mosaic during FY2015 that could conflict with the independence of this work.

Trucost plc
London, April 2016

Alastair MacGregor
Director