



HP Ranking = 5.7/10

HP scores top points for providing a substitution timeline for future substances on its radar, strong support for Individual Producer Responsibility and for being the first major company to devise an electronic waste take back / recycling metric based on percent of sales. HP loses points for failing to provide timelines for the complete elimination of toxic polyvinyl chloride (PVC) and all brominated flame retardants (BFRs).

The 2007 date on HP's website is misleading. Their goal is to prepare a substitution plan for BFRs and PVC in 2007, not to eliminate these harmful substances during that year.

In September 2006, one penalty point was deducted from the company's overall score when testing of an HP laptop revealed the presence of a type of brominated flame retardant, known as decaBDE, that HP claims not to use. HP has uploaded a statement to its website that reaffirms their commitment to non-use of decaBDE, explains how decaBDE came to be found in an HP laptop and what action was taken to avoid similar problems in the future. Thus the penalty point has been lifted. See the statement at:

http://www.hp.com/hpinfo/globalcitizenship/environment/productdesign/sept_2006_greenpeace_report.html

HP Overall Score

| | BAD (0) | PARTIALLY BAD (1+) | PARTIALLY GOOD (2+) | GOOD (3+) |
|--|---------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Precautionary Principle | | | ■ | |
| Chemicals Management | | | | ■ |
| Timeline for PVC phaseout | | ■ | | |
| Timeline for BFR phaseout | | ■ | | |
| PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (companies score double on this criterion) | ■ | | | |
| Individual producer responsibility | | | | ■ |
| Voluntary takeback | | | ■ | |
| Information to individual customers | | | ■ | |
| Amounts recycled | | | | ■ |

HP Detailed Scoring

| Chemical Score | BAD | PARTIALLY BAD | PARTIALLY GOOD | GOOD |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Precautionary Principle | | | Definition of precautionary principle does not reflect the need to eliminate potentially harmful chemicals even without full scientific certainty of harm. More information | |
| Chemicals Management | | | | A Substitution timeline, with substances identified by stakeholders as materials of concern helps HP score top marks on this criterion General Specification for the Environment. |
| Timeline for PVC phaseout | | Internal communication with HP reveals that the timeline of 2007 is in fact only to provide a substitution plan for PVC elimination. More information | | |
| Timeline for BFR phaseout | | Internal communication with HP reveals that the timeline of 2007 is in fact only to provide a substitution plan for BFR elimination. More information | | |
| PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (companies score double on this criterion) | No BFR-free or PVC-free models on the market. More information | | | |

| EPR/recycling score | BAD | PARTIALLY BAD | PARTIALLY GOOD | GOOD |
|--|-----|---------------|---|---|
| Support for Individual Producer Responsibility | | | | Strong and explicit support for IPR |
| Provides voluntary takeback where no EPR laws exist | | | Voluntary takeback - not for all products and not in every region of the world More information e.g. Voluntary byteback prog in Victoria, Australia China, Thailand | |
| Provides info for individual customers on takeback in all countries where products are sold | | | No information for consumers in Latin America or Africa. Info on a range of options (asset recovery, donation). HP Planet Partners for many (non-EPR) countries but not all (e.g. not Latin America or Africa). | |
| Reports on amount of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) collected and recycled | | | | The first company to devise takeback metric based on % sales . 2006 GCR reports recycling/reuse volumes were 10.3% of sales. [also reports in lbs recycled in 2005 & cumulative lbs] |

Ranking criteria explained

The ranking criteria reflect the demands of the Toxic Tech campaign to the electronics companies. Our two demands are that companies should:

- clean up their products by eliminating hazardous substances;
- takeback and recycle their products responsibly once they become obsolete.

The two issues are connected. The use of harmful chemicals in electronics prevents their safe recycling when the products are discarded. Companies score marks out of 30, which are then re-calculated to give a mark out of 10 for simplicity.

Toxic chemicals criteria

Greenpeace wants to see electronics companies clean up their act.

Substituting harmful chemicals in the production of electronics will prevent worker exposure to these substances and contamination of communities that neighbour production facilities. Eliminating harmful substances will also prevent leaching/off-gassing of chemicals like brominated flame retardants (BFR) during use, and enable electronic scrap to be safely recycled. The presence of toxic substances in electronics perpetuates the toxic cycle – during reprocessing of electronic waste and by using contaminated secondary materials to make new products.

Until the use of toxic substances is eliminated, it is impossible to secure 'safe' recycling. For this reason, the points awarded to corporate practice on chemicals (five criteria, double points for PVC – and BFR-free models) are weighted more heavily than criteria on recycling, because until the use of harmful substances is eliminated in products, it is impossible to secure 'safe', toxic-free recycling.

The electronics scorecard ranks companies on:

Chemicals policy and practice (5 criteria)

1. A chemicals policy based on the Precautionary Principle
2. Chemicals Management: supply chain management of chemicals via e.g. banned/restricted substance lists, policy to identify problematic substances for future elimination/substitution
3. Timeline for phasing out all use of vinyl plastic (PVC)
4. Timeline for phasing out all use of brominated flame retardants (not just those banned by EU's RoHS Directive)
5. PVC- and BFR-free models of electronic products on the market.

Policy and practice on Producer Responsibility for taking back their discarded products and recycling (4 criteria)

1. Support for individual (financial) producer responsibility – that producers finance the end-of-life management of their products, by taking back and reusing/recycling their own-brand discarded products.
2. Provides voluntary takeback and recycling in every country where it sells its products, even in the absence of national laws requiring Producer Responsibility for electronic waste.
3. Provides clear information for individual customers on takeback and recycling services in all countries where there are sales of its products.
4. Reports on amount of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) collected and recycled.

Click here to see more detailed information on the ranking

Ranking regrading: Companies have the opportunity to move towards a greener ranking as the guide will be updated every quarter. However penalty points will be deducted from overall scores if Greenpeace finds a company lying, practising double standards or other corporate misconduct.

Disclaimer: Greenpeace's 'Guide to Greener Electronics' aims to clean up the electronics sector and get manufacturers to take responsibility for the full life cycle of their products, including the electronic waste that their products generate. The guide does not rank companies on labour standards, energy use or any other issues, but recognises that these are important in the production and use of electronics products.

For the latest version [greenpeace.org/greenelectronics](https://www.greenpeace.org/greenelectronics)