



## PHILIPS Ranking = 5.3/10

Philips falls from 4th to 7th place with a slightly reduced score of 5.3 points. Philips now supports IPR and is committed to actively work towards developing IPR based recycling systems and their supporting financial mechanisms; it doesn't score more points on this criterion yet, because it now has to put this commitment into practice. Philips also scores a point for its voluntary take-back pilots and for reporting on the recycling rate of the e-waste it collects in Europe and now needs to demonstrate its commitment to taking responsibility for its own e-waste by expanding its take-back programme and improving the information that its provides to its customers.

Philips scores well on both toxic chemical and energy issues. On chemicals, Philips has committed to eliminating all phthalates and antimony by December 31 2010. Beryllium and its compounds are already restricted and arsenic is to be phased out of TV glass and other display products from 2008. Philips has now put on the market TVs with PVC/BFR-free housings (EU market only so far), PBV/BFR-free Senseo and oral healthcare products and a PVC-free remote control, but these are insufficient to score one point (doubled).

Philips drops a point (doubled) on energy, because it is unclear if it is reporting to the latest Energy Star standards for TVs and external power supplies. Philips scores full marks for supporting the levels of cuts in greenhouse gases needed to abate dangerous climate change and committing to absolute cuts in its operational carbon footprint of 25% by 2012 (using a baseline year of 2007). It also scores points for disclosing externally verified carbon dioxide equivalent emissions and for sourcing 15% of all electricity used in 2008 from renewables.

## PHILIPS Overall Score

	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)	GOOD (3+)
Precautionary Principle				
Chemicals Management				
Timeline for PVC & BFR phaseout				
Timeline for additional substances phaseout				
PVC-free and/or BFR-free models <small>(companies score double on this criterion)</small>				
Individual producer responsibility				
Voluntary take-back				
Information to individual customers				
Amounts recycled				
Use of recycled plastic content				
Global GHG emissions reduction support				
Carbon Footprint disclosure				
Own GHG emissions reduction commitment				
Amounts of renewable energy used				
Energy efficiency of new models <small>(companies score double on this criterion)</small>				

# PHILIPS Detailed Scoring

## Chemicals

Precautionary Principle	Chemicals Management	Timeline for PVC & BFR phaseout	Timeline for additional substances phaseout	PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (double points)
<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>
Philips' definition of the Precautionary Principle identifies the need to take preventative measures without full scientific certainty. <b>More information.</b>	Philips scores top marks for providing Product and Process Specs, criteria for identifying 'future substances' for elimination and examples, namely 'reported' substances. <b>More information.</b> <b>Restricted substances in Products list.</b> <b>Restricted substances in Processes list.</b> <b>Criteria for identifying 'future' substances for phase out.</b> <b>List of "relevant" substances.</b>	Philips had a goal to have certain models of consumer products free of PVC and BFRs by the end of 2008 and aims to phase out PVC and all BFRs in new models by the end of 2010. Philips has eliminated BFRs and PVC in TV housings for the EU market, in Senseo and oral healthcare products. <b>More information.</b>	All phthalates and antimony will be eliminated by December 31 2010. Arsenic is to be eliminated from TV glass and other displays from 2008. <b>More information.</b> Beryllium and its compounds are already restricted with a threshold of 1000 ppm, but include exemptions. <b>More information.</b> Philips needs to provide a timeline for overcoming the exemptions on beryllium.	Philips has put on the market TVs with PVC/BFR-free housings (EU market only so far), PBV/BFR-free Senseo and oral healthcare products and a PVC-free remote control. <b>More information.</b>

## E-Waste

Support for Individual Producer Responsibility	Provides voluntary take-back where no EPR laws exist	Provides info for individual customers on take-back in all countries where products are sold	Reports on amount of e-waste collected and recycled	Use of recycled plastic content in products - and timelines for increasing content
<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>
Philips supports the principle of Individual Producer Responsibility (IPR) and has pledged to actively work towards developing IPR based recycling systems and their supporting financial mechanisms. <b>More information.</b> Coherent with their support of IPR Philips has clarified that they do not support the use of the Visible Fee for new WEEE. For full marks on IPR Philips needs to sign the EU IPR coalition statement and reject Art 14.2. (continued use of the Visible Fee) of the EC proposal for a revised WEEE Directive. Like other brands that support IPR Philips must support, and promote for the WEEE revision, a system that would shift to differentiated/ individualised financing for own-brand real end-of-life costs, e.g. no longer using collective financing such as market share but instead individualised financing reflecting real costs such as a return share system.	It is Philips' intention to help establish global collection and recycling systems. <b>More information.</b> Philips has set up a pilot project in India encompassing 8 cities with 27 service centres. <b>More information.</b> Pilot projects have also started in Brazil and Argentina, otherwise, there is no voluntary take-back offered by Philips, although in the US Philips lists local recyclers for customers to contact. <b>More information.</b> To stay on 1 point, Philips needs to institutionalise the pilot projects and expand its take-back programme to other countries.	Philips provides general advice to customers on recycling, contacts for recyclers in most of the EU (excluding some New Member States), and a search tool to locate recyclers courtesy of the Consumer Electronics Association in the US. Philips fails to score any points because the EU links are mainly to recyclers of lighting equipment only. <b>More information.</b> <b>Much improved information for customers in India.</b>	Philips reports amounts (in tons) of end-of-life displays recycled in EU with a recycling rate of 65% in 2007, 47% in 2006, and 26% in 2005, based on an average lifespan of 10 years. Philips scores 1 point, as the data is at least partly based on sampling return rates in some EU countries, although in other countries this data is based on current market share. To earn more points, Philips needs to extend the geographical coverage of its reporting and provide EU figures from own brand sampling of return rate, undertaken in at least one Northern EU country, one Southern EU country and one new Member State – and provide indications of how it intends to expand this sampling in the future. <b>More information.</b>	No information is given on use of recycled plastics.

## Energy

Support for global mandatory reduction of GHG emissions	Company carbon footprint disclosure	Commitment to reduce own direct GHG emissions	Amount of renewable energy used	Energy efficiency of New Models (double points)
<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>
Philips believes that global emissions should peak in 2015 and decline thereafter to achieve a 50-80% cut in 2050. It supports mandatory cuts in domestic emissions in industrialised countries of at least 30% by 2020. <b>More information.</b>	Philips discloses its CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions to be approximately 2.147 million tons in 2008 that are verified by KPMG in its Sustainability Report. Some of these emissions are from supply chain inbound logistics. For top marks, emissions from a second stage of the product supply chain (scope 3) are needed. <b>More information.</b> <b>Data definitions and scope – p.181, Operational carbon footprint – p.183-184, KPMG verification – p.189</b>	Philips is committed to reducing its operational carbon footprint by 25% by 2012, using 2007 as a baseline. Philips needs to demonstrate its progress towards this target. <b>More information.</b>	In 2008, Philips doubled its purchase of green electricity from 7% in 2007 to 15% in 2008. By 2012, the number of sites that use green electricity should be raised to the level needed to achieve the 25% carbon footprint reduction target by 2012. For maximum points Philips needs to increase its purchasing of renewable energy and address concerns about the additionality of its RECs. <b>More information.</b>	Some 71% of all TV models put on the US market after 2005 met the Energy Star standard. But data are only for the US market. In 2008 all TV models exceed the ES requirements for standby power consumption by at least 70%. <b>More information.</b> 10% of Philips current battery chargers models fulfil the Energy Star requirements. These models exceed the technical Energy Star requirements by 5-15%. <b>More information.</b> Philips loses a point as it is unclear if it is reporting to the latest Energy Star standard, v.3 for TVs and v.2 for EPS.

## Criteria on Toxic Chemicals

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.

The issue of toxicity is overarching. 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 are weighted more heavily than criteria on recycling.

Although there are five criteria on both chemicals and waste, the top score on chemicals is 18 points, as double points are awarded for vinyl plastic-free (PVC) and BFR-free models on the market, whereas the top score on e-waste is 15 points.

The criteria on Precautionary Principle and Chemicals Management remain the same. The criterion: BFR-free and PVC-free models on the market, also remains the same and continues to score double points.

The two former criteria: Commitment to eliminating PVC with timeline and Commitment to eliminating all BFRs with timeline, have been merged into one criterion, with the lower level of commitment to PVC or BFR elimination determining the score on this criterion.

A new criterion has been added, namely Phase out of additional substances with timeline(s). The additional substances, many of which have already been identified by the brands as suspect substances for potential future elimination are:

- (1) all phthalates,
- (2) beryllium, including alloys and compounds and
- (3) antimony/antimony compounds

## Criteria on e-waste

Greenpeace expects companies to take financial responsibility for dealing with the electronic waste (e-waste) generated by their products, to take back discarded products in all countries with sales of their products and to re-use or recycle them responsibly. Individual Producer Responsibility (IPR) provides a feedback loop to the product designers of the end-of-life costs of treating discarded electronic products and thus an incentive to design out those costs.

An additional e-waste criterion has been added and most of the existing criteria have been sharpened, with additional demands. The new e-waste criterion requires the brands to report on the use of recycled plastic content across all products and provide timelines for increasing content.

## Criteria on energy

The five new energy criteria address key expectations that Greenpeace has of responsible companies that are serious about tackling climate change. They are:

- (1) Support for global mandatory reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions;
- (2) Disclosure of the company's own GHG emissions plus emissions from two stages of the supply chain;
- (3) Commitment to reduce the company's own GHG emissions with timelines;
- (4) Amount of renewable energy used
- (5) Energy efficiency of new models (companies score double on this criterion)

**Click here to see more detailed information on the ranking**

## Ranking criteria explained

As of the 8th edition of the Guide to Greener Electronics, Greenpeace scores electronics brands on a tightened set of chemicals and e-waste criteria, (which include new criteria) and on new energy criteria.

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

- (1) clean up their products by eliminating hazardous substances; and
- (2) take-back and recycle their products responsibly once they become obsolete.

The two issues are connected: the use of harmful chemicals in electronic products prevents their safe recycling once the products are discarded.

Given the increasing evidence of climate change and the urgency of addressing this issue, Greenpeace has added new energy criteria to encourage electronics companies to:

- (3) improve their corporate policies and practices with respect to Climate and Energy

**Ranking regrading:** Companies have the opportunity to move towards a greener ranking as the guide will continue to be updated every quarter. However penalty points will be deducted from overall scores if Greenpeace finds a company lying, practicing 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 and the energy used by their products and operations.

The guide does not rank companies on labour standards, social responsibility or any other issues, but recognises that these are important in the production and use of electronics products.

**Changes in ranking guide:** We first released our 'Guide to Greener Electronics' in August 2006, which ranked the 14 top manufacturers of personal computers and mobile phones according to their policies on toxic chemicals and recycling.

In the sixth issue of the Guide, we added the leading manufacturers of TVs – namely, Philips and Sharp – and the game console producers Nintendo and Microsoft. The other market leaders for TVs and game consoles are already included in the Guide.

In the eighth edition, we sharpened some of the existing ranking criteria on toxic chemicals and e-waste and added a criterion on each issue. We also added five new energy criteria.

Fujitsu is evaluated for the first time in this version of the Guide, having acquired the Siemens share in Fujitsu Siemens Computers (FSC). The new company is operating under the brand Fujitsu from April 1, 2009.

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

In version 11 of the Guide, PC manufacturers HP, Dell and Lenovo were served a penalty point for backtracking on their commitment to eliminate vinyl plastic (PVC) and brominated flame retardants (BFRs) from their products from the end of 2009. All three continue to be penalised in this version.