



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.

Where two companies score the same number of total points, the company with the higher score on the chemicals criteria will be ranked higher.

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)

One penalty point has been deducted from the overall scores of LGE for corporate double standards on Individual Producer Responsibility (IPR) for products discarded by consumers.

LGE's global website states that the company believes that the producer (not consumer) should be responsible for financing the waste management of its own brand products when they are discarded; in the US, LGE is part of a Coalition that has been opposing Producer Responsibility and lobbying for U.S. consumers to pay an Advanced Recycling Fee (ARF).

LG ELECTRONICS Ranking = 3.6/10

LGE is in a free-fall down the ranking due to a penalty point served on the company for corporate double standards on Individual Producer Responsibility. While LGE's global website states that the company believes that the producer (not consumer) should be responsible for financing the waste management of its own brand products when they are discarded, in the US, LGE is part of a Coalition that has been opposing Producer Responsibility and lobbying for U.S. consumers to pay an Advanced Recycling Fee (ARF).

On the positive side, LGE gains points for launching mobile phone models that are free of brominated flame retardants (BFRs). LGE needs to improve on product take back and recycling.

LG ELECTRONICS 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				

LG ELECTRONICS Detailed Scoring

Chemical Score	BAD	PARTIALLY BAD	PARTIALLY GOOD	GOOD
Precautionary Principle				LGE provides a strong definition of the precautionary principle reflecting the need to take action to eliminate harmful chemicals even though their effects may not be scientifically proven. More information.
Chemicals Management			LGE provides a substance list that includes future substances to be reduced, including beryllium and antimony. More information.	
Timeline for PVC phaseout				The first PVC-free products are to be launched in 2008; the remaining uses of PVC are to be phased out by the end of 2010. More information.
Timeline for BFR phaseout				All new models released in 2010 are to be BFR-free. More information.
PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (companies score double on this criterion)		LGE's mobile phone division now has some BFR free models, with more models being put on the market soon. More information.		

EPR/recycling score	BAD	PARTIALLY BAD	PARTIALLY GOOD	GOOD
Support for Individual Producer Responsibility	LGE lost 3 points (in support of IPR) in December 2006 due to double standards. LGE claims to support IPR on its global website . But in the US, LGE is part of the Electronic Manufacturers' Coalition for Responsible Recycling which does not support EPR, but is demanding that consumers pay ARFs (Advanced Recycling Fees) More information. LGE gets a penalty for double standards: accepting its responsibility for financing the recycling of its own-brand discarded products in Europe, but in the US expecting the consumer to pay these costs			
Provides voluntary takeback where no EPR laws exist	No information about LGE's voluntary takeback programmes on their website. More information.			
Provides info for individual customers on takeback in all countries where products are sold	No information on what customers can do with their discarded LGE e-waste. More information.			
Reports on amount of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) collected and recycled		LGE provides information on their recycling rates only in Japan and Korea. More information.		