



NINTENDO Ranking = 1.8/10

Nintendo remains in last place with the same score of 1.8 out of 10.

Nintendo scores most points on chemicals; it has put games consoles on the market that have PVC-free internal wiring. It has banned phthalates and is monitoring use of antimony and beryllium. Although it is endeavouring to eliminate the use of PVC, it has not set a timeline for its phase-out. It scores points for adopting the precautionary principle in its approach to managing chemical substances and for publishing its Standards for chemicals management.

It continues to score zero on all e-waste criteria and although it has improved its information to customers about access to its take-back programme in the US and Canada, this is not enough to score points.

It scores points on energy criteria, for the energy efficiency of its low power AC adaptor for the Nintendo DSi, which meets the requirements for external power supplies in the Energy Star programme. It also retains a point on energy for disclosing carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from its own operations. However, it fails to score for its commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, due to a second year of increases, despite a commitment to cut CO₂ emissions and other greenhouse gases by 2 percent over each previous year. Emissions in 2007 increased by 1.5 percent compared to 2006, following a rise of 6 percent in 2006. Nintendo has updated its website since this assessment was made.

Nintendo has updated its web-site since this assessment was made.

NINTENDO Overall Score

	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)	GOOD (3+)
Precautionary Principle and support for revision of RoHS Directive.				
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>				

NINTENDO Detailed Scoring

Chemicals

Precautionary Principle and support for revision of RoHS Directive.	Chemicals Management	Timeline for PVC & BFR phaseout	Timeline for additional substances phaseout	PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (double points)
PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)
Nintendo scores a point for following the Precautionary Principle, even if adverse effects have not been scientifically proven. However, Nintendo makes no mention of the need for RoHS 2.0 to adopt a ban on organo- chlorine and bromine compounds (at least PVC, CFRs, and BFRs within 3-5 years) as well as an end-of-life focused methodology for adding future substance restrictions. More information here and here.	Nintendo publishes its 'Environmental Control Standards' including lists of substances that are banned, subject to early withdrawal, and under application control. More information. Nintendo scores two points for publishing its Standards for Environment-Related Substance. However, it still needs to outline its criteria for identifying future substances for restriction. More information.	PVC is listed as a substance 'subject to early withdrawal' and Nintendo states that it is 'currently working towards eliminating' it. More information. Nintendo aims to minimise and ultimately eliminate the use of PVC and BFRs in its manufacturing processes. However, no timeline is given for their phase-out. More information.	Six types of Phthalates are listed as 'banned substances' by Nintendo on their Environment-Related Substances List. Antimony and Beryllium and their compounds and Bis (2-methoxyethyl) phthalate are listed as substances under application control. More information.	Nintendo states that PVC was completely eliminated from the internal wiring of games consoles. More information here and here.

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
BAD (0)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)
Nintendo considers the promotion of recycling of used products and packaging to be one of its most important responsibilities and complies with the laws of each region. However, there is no reference to Individual Producer Responsibility. More information. To score points, Nintendo needs to explicitly support and demonstrate an understanding of IPR, for example clarifying that it understands IPR as full internalisation and transparent feedback of its products real end-of-life costs, ie through differentiated financing that accounts for each brand separately.	Nintendo of America (NOA) now provides free take-back to customers in the US and Canada and links to the Environment Canada recycling information website in addition to USEPA's eCycling hardware and battery recycling programmes. It also provides a phone number with business hours given in Pacific time for hardware and battery recycling. More information here and here.	Nintendo.com (America) provides a phone number for customers in the US and Canada and a Take Back Program form for US customers and gives links to Environment Canada recycling information and the US EPA disposal and recycling pages. More information. Information on product take-back systems in Europe is available on the packaging and in the manuals of products. More information.	Nintendo of America claims a near 100% recycling rate for product returns and repairs in the US, and reports that the total amount of used products returned by customers in FY2008 was 552 tons. However, there is no information on its recycling performance in other parts of the world. More information. Updated figures for FY2010 are provided on the NOA website: 814 tons of materials received from consumers and retailers were recycled or re-used. More information.	No information.

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)
BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)
Nintendo states that the reduction of CO ₂ emissions is one of the most important issues for the world today. However, to score on this criterion Nintendo needs to support mandatory cuts of at least 30% by 2020 and call for global GHG emissions to peak by 2015. More information.	Nintendo reports on emissions of CO ₂ , both absolute and per sales unit, for all business offices in 2008, except Nintendo of Korea, but these are not externally verified. More information.	Nintendo aims to reduce CO ₂ emissions and other greenhouse gases by 2% over each previous year. However, Nintendo scores zero as emissions in 2008 increased by 1.2% compared to 2007, following a rise of 1.5% in 2007 and 6% in 2006. Nintendo intends to step-up its efforts on reducing CO ₂ emissions. More information.	No information	Nintendo has developed a low power AC adaptor for the Nintendo DSi that meets the requirements on the external power supply in the Energy Star Program for energy-efficient products. Even though the game consoles are not subject to the Energy Star Program at this stage, the Nintendo DSi adaptor (100v-120v) meets the requirements equivalent to the current strictest level V requirements (standby power: 0.3W; average efficiency: 66.8% ; rated output power: 4.14 W). Both the Wii console and the DSi also meet the requirements of the EuP Directive that came into effect in 2010. More information here and here.

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 first criterion has been sharpened to require companies not only to have a chemicals policy underpinned by the Precautionary Principle, but also to support a revision of the RoHS Directive that bans further harmful substances, specifically BFRs, chlorinated flame retardants (CFRs) and PVC. The criterion on Chemicals Management remains 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. In the fourteenth edition the criteria for the Precautionary Principle was made more challenging.

For the latest version greenpeace.org/greenelectronics

Toshiba, Samsung, LGE, Dell and Lenovo continue to be penalised in this latest version of the Guide for backtracking on their commitments to phase out vinyl plastic (PVC) and brominated flame retardants (BFRs). Toshiba is served with a further penalty point for misleading its customers and Greenpeace by not admitting that it would not meet its commitment. In addition, Microsoft is served with a penalty point for the first time for backtracking on its commitment to phase out PVC and BFRs by the end of 2010.