



SAMSUNG Ranking = 4/10

Samsung gets top marks for providing a timeline for phasing out brominated flame retardants (BFRs). It loses points for providing voluntary product take back of its electronic waste only in a few countries and only for some product groups. The company is also weak on information to consumers on what to do with their discarded Samsung products and on reporting on the amounts of electronic-waste collected and recycled.

Samsung's downward slide in the ranking is due to its double standards on Individual Producer Responsibility (IPR), losing it the points scored for supporting IPR. While Samsung'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, Samsung is part of a Coalition that has been opposing Producer Responsibility and lobbying for US consumers to pay an Advanced Recycling Fee (ARF).

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.

SAMSUNG 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				

SAMSUNG Detailed Scoring

Chemical Score	BAD	PARTIALLY BAD	PARTIALLY GOOD	GOOD
Precautionary Principle			Although Samsung states they will 'consider' cases where the scientific evidence on a suspect chemical is conflicting, it states nowhere in the definition what that 'consideration' means in practice e.g. substitution or just restriction and management. Policy on target substances	
Chemicals Management			Samsung loses a point for failing to have a system for identifying future chemicals to be targeted for elimination. Identification and management of targeted substances. Eco-Partner Certification Program	
Timeline for PVC phaseout			The timeline of 2011 for complete elimination of PVC is not reasonable, which is why Samsung does not score a 'yes'. Timeline	
Timeline for BFR phaseout				Samsung scores a yes for providing a timeline of 2010 for phasing out BFRs in all applications. The greening of products
PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (companies score double on this criterion)	No BFR-free or PVC-free models on the market.			

EPR/recycling score	BAD	PARTIALLY BAD	PARTIALLY GOOD	GOOD
Support for Individual Producer Responsibility	<p>Samsung loses its 3 points (in support of IPR) due to double standards. Samsung claims to support IPR on its global website</p> <p>More info But in the US, Samsung is part of the Electronic Manufacturers' Coalition for Responsible Recycling which does not support EPR. Instead, the Coalition is demanding that consumers pay ARFs (Advanced Recycling Fees). More info</p>			
Provides voluntary takeback where no EPR laws exist		<p>Samsung loses points for providing voluntary takeback only in a few countries and only for some product groups. Toner cartridges Korea and EU. Part of UNEP's MPPI for mobiles – setting up in Egypt & Romania. Has been involved in pilot takeback in North America (Washington) and China (mobiles only).</p> <p>Domestic recycling program</p>		
Provides info for individual customers on takeback in all countries where products are sold		<p>Information provided to consumers only in some countries, and the quality of this information could be improved.</p> <p>Info for EU + Europe + US, Canada, Japan and Korea.</p> <p>Product take-back and recycling programs</p>		
Reports on amount of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) collected and recycled		<p>Samsung reports on amounts of WEEE collected & recycled, but only in Korea, EU and most recently in North America, as well as mobiles in China.</p> <p>More information</p>		

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.

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/greenerelectronics](https://www.greenpeace.org/greenerelectronics)