



## MICROSOFT Ranking = 2.2/10

Microsoft is in 17th position with a miserable score of 2.2 points, mainly on toxic chemicals criteria. The company provides a timeline of the end of 2010 for eliminating phthalates.

On e-waste, Microsoft scores only on its weak support for Individual Producer Responsibility. On energy, the company only scores for reporting its total carbon dioxide equivalent emissions, from its own operations and although it now has a Climate Change Policy it makes no reference to specific reduction targets for greenhouse gases.

## MICROSOFT 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				

# MICROSOFT 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>PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>
Microsoft now has a definition of the Precautionary Principle, as defined in the UN Rio declaration. However, for top marks, the policy needs to be made more prominent on the website. It is currently hidden away on the last (p.14) of Microsoft's H00594 Restricted Substances Specification. <b>More information.</b> Select 'business practices' & 'Restricted Substances for Hardware Products' to download document (may require software). <b>More information.</b>	Microsoft lists its Chemical Specifications and a procedure for identifying future substances for elimination ( <b>see Section D, page 14 of H00594 Restricted Substances Specification</b> ). Suspect substances for potential future elimination include those on the Canada Environmental Protection Act Domestic Substance List and California Proposition 65 List. However, the latter List includes 100s of substances, most of which are not used by the electronics industry. <b>Restricted Substance Control System (H00642).</b>	Microsoft is committed to eliminating PVC and brominated flame retardants from all of its hardware products by or before 2010. <b>More information.</b> Select 'business practices' & 'Sustainability Fact Sheet' (may require software).	Microsoft provides a timeline of the end of 2010 for eliminating phthalates. See Section D, page 13 of H00594 <b>Restricted Substances Specification</b> . Microsoft currently restricts certain phthalates and antimony in line with the EU Toys Directive, for use in selected products such as game controllers Beryllium compounds, antimony and phthalates are all listed as reportable substances.	No products free of PVC and BFRs.

## 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>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>
Although Microsoft now states that it "supports the mandatory collection and recycling of consumer electronics funded by individual producers...", for full marks, Microsoft needs to support the principle of Individual Producer Responsibility more explicitly and lobby for its operationalisation. <b>More information.</b> Select 'business practices' & 'Sustainability Fact Sheet'.	Microsoft's Authorised Refurbisher (MAR) Programme extends the lifespan of otherwise obsolete PCs. <b>More information here and here.</b>	Microsoft provides links to various recycling initiatives by Microsoft (MAR, Digital Pipeline), other organisations (eg. CEA's myGreenElectronics) and other electronic manufacturers but it still does not provide free take-back for its own products. <b>More information.</b> A link listing Microsoft's recycling partners in the EU requires software to download. Links to individual EU country sites are unhelpful as they do not connect to the Environmental Ministries responsible for WEEE Directive enforcement or to the Producer Responsibility Organisations.	No 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)
<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>
Microsoft now has a Climate Change Policy Statement which supports government actions to transition to a low-carbon economy. However, the need for mandatory reduction of GHG emission is not mentioned. <b>More information.</b> Performance.	Microsoft reports its total CO2 equivalent emissions at 416170 metric tonnes globally (scope 1 and 2) and reports 222710 tonnes of CO2 emissions from employee business travel (scope 3) but these are not third party verified. <b>More information.</b> Carbon Disclosure Project, see p.4.	Microsoft has not set specific emissions reduction targets. <b>More information.</b> Carbon Disclosure Project, see p.7.	Microsoft does not state the percentage of renewable energy used. However, several of its utility providers have renewables in their portfolios and the Quincy site is served by a utility with 100% hydro power. <b>More information.</b> Carbon Disclosure Project, see p.5. Microsoft uses renewable energy at its facilities and plans to increase its use but no targets are given. 'Sustainability Fact Sheet' (may require software).	No information.

## 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.

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

Philips continues to get a penalty point; however, this is no longer for double standards (as the Electronic Manufacturers' Coalition for Responsible Recycling has been dissolved), but for bad lobby in the EU on Revision of WEEE Directive.