



### PHILIPS Ranking = 4.3/10

Philips is now in 12th place, scoring 4.3, reduced from its overall score of 5.3 points because it keeps the penalty point incurred in v.8, due to regressive lobbying against the principle of Individual Producer Responsibility in a consultation on the revision of the EU WEEE Directive. Philips previously incurred a penalty point for its membership of the Electronic Manufacturers' Coalition for Responsible Recycling in the US. This coalition has now been dissolved. Philips also scores zero on most of the other e-waste criteria, but gains a point for reporting on the recycling rate of the e-waste it collects in Europe.

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 also increased its score on energy by supporting mandatory cuts in greenhouse gases by industrialised countries of at least 30%. It continues to score the highest marks of all the ranked brands on energy criteria, disclosing externally verified carbon dioxide equivalent emissions, committing to absolute cuts in its operational carbon footprint by 25% by 2012 (using a baseline year of 2007) and sourcing 10% of its electricity in 2007 from renewable sources. Although Philips scores well on energy efficiency, reporting that some 71% of all TV models put on the US market after 2005 met the Energy Star standard, these data are only for US models and not all their new models globally. 10% of Philips current battery charger models fulfil the Energy Star requirements. These models exceed the technical Energy Star requirements by 5-15%.

### 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				

## 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 now identifies the need to take preventative measures without full scientific certainty. <b>More information.</b> <b>Sustainability Report.</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 "reported" substances.</b>	Philips aims to have certain models of consumer products free of PVC and BFRs by the end of 2008 and to phase out PVC and all BFRs in new models by the end of 2010. Philips has eliminated BFRs in TV housings for the EU market. <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>	Green Flagship products are listed but there are no examples of BFR free or PVC free products. <b>More information.</b> <b>See Sustainability Report 2007</b> (p84-85).

### 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>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>
Philips acknowledges that IPR can be a mechanism to improve product design. <b>More information.</b> However, Philips scores no points on this criterion and keeps the penalty point incurred in v.8, because it has been lobbying against the principle of Individual Producer Responsibility in a consultation on revision of the EU WEEE Directive. <b>More information.</b> Philips previously incurred a penalty point for its membership of the 'Electronic Manufacturers' Coalition for Responsible Recycling in the US. This coalition has now been dissolved. <b>More information.</b>	No voluntary take-back offered by Philips, although in the US Philips lists local recyclers for customers to contact. Philips is to start pilot projects for voluntary product recycling in 2008 in India and early 2009 in Brazil and Argentina. <b>More information here and here.</b>	Philips provides general advice to customers on recycling. <b>More information.</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 GOOD (2+)</b>
Philips supports cuts of 50% of global emissions by 2050, and states that mandatory cuts of at least 30% by 2020 are needed in industrialised countries. <b>More information.</b>	Philips discloses its CO2 equivalent emissions to be approximately 2.35 million tons 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>Sustainability Report 2007</b> (pp.24-25 and 68-96).	Philips is committed to reducing its operational carbon footprint by 25% by 2012, using 2007 as a baseline. <b>More information here and here.</b>	Approximately 10% of purchased electricity in 2007 was generated by renewable sources. 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. <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. <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>

## 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.