



SHARP Ranking = 3.1/10

Sharp drops to 16th place with a score of 3.1, mainly because although it reports on many models of TVs that comply with the Energy Star requirements, the reporting period that this information refers to is not supplied.

Sharp scores well on its policy and practice on toxic chemical issues; it has launched many models of LCD TVs and solar modules that are free of PVC (except accessories) and has committed to eliminating phthalates from all products by the end of 2010.

On e-waste criteria, Sharp scores pitifully, only gaining points for information provided to consumers in a few countries on what to do with their discarded Sharp branded products and for the use of small amounts of recycled plastic.

Sharp discloses third party verified greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from its own operations but needs to do more on the other energy criteria

SHARP Overall Score

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

SHARP 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)
GOOD (3+)	PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)	GOOD (3+)	PARTIALLY GOOD (2+)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)
Sharp scores top marks for its commitment and understanding of the Precautionary Principle. More information. Basic Environmental Philosophy (point 2.2).	To achieve top marks Sharp needs to define the criteria for identifying substances for future elimination. Manual for Survey of Chemical Substances and Green Procurement Guidelines. Manual for Survey of Chemical Substances Contained in Parts and Materials. Green Procurement Guidelines.	Sharp commits to eliminate PVC and BFRs from all products by the end of 2010, provided it can find suitable alternatives. More information.	Sharp commits to eliminate phthalates and antimony from all products by the end of 2010, provided it can find suitable alternatives. The company has already banned beryllium, but there are too many exemptions to score top marks. More information.	Sharp provides a list of many models of LCD TVs and solar modules that are free of PVC, except accessories. Many models of LCD TVs, DVD projectors, audio and video products have casings free of BFRs, but none are totally free of BFRs. More information.

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)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)
Sharp refers to Producer Responsibility but only in the context of complying with EU WEEE Directive. More information here and here.	Sharp stays on zero as the voluntary take-back efforts to date are insufficient to score one point. More information. In the US, Sharp is part of US EPA's Plug-In To eCycling. Offers voluntary take-back of toner cartridges in Canada, France and Japan, and mobiles (Mobile Muster) in Australia: In Canada, Sharp also recycles old electronic equipment for a small fee, through a recycling partner, Accu-Shred. More information.	Links to local Sharp contacts are now provided for customers in EU, US and Canada, and now also Japan and Australia. However, Sharp provides customers only with email addresses; no telephone contacts. More information.	Although Sharp provides figures for recycling of TVs, copiers, PCs & washing machines (in units and wt) as well as weight of batteries collected in Japan for 2007, it does not report this as a percentage of past (or even current) sales. More information here and here. Sharp also reports on amounts of used electrical products collected in Maine, Minnesota and as part of the EPA Plug-in to eCycling program, and the amounts in EU in 2007, but none of these data are reported as a percentage of past sales. More information.	In 2007 Sharp recycled 850 tons of post-consumer plastics and has a target to increase this to 1000 tons in 2008. The data is not presented as a percentage of all plastic sourced. More information here and here.

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 GOOD (2+)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)
Sharp refers to Cool Earth 50, a global initiative for reducing GHG emissions of all countries to half the current level by 2050. However, the 50% cut is from current, not 1990, levels, does not specify by how much industrialised countries need to cut their emissions and does not call for mandatory targets. More information.	Sharp reports on GHG emissions from its own operations in absolute terms and per production unit. More information. Verification details. Calculation standards for Envi Performance Indices.	Sharp has a target to reduce relative CO2 emissions (per adjusted production unit) by 28% compared to fiscal 1990 by 2010, but for domestic production sites only. There is no target for an absolute reduction of emissions of all GHGs. See CSR report 2008 (p.24 - 25)	Sharp does not identify the proportion of renewable energy used, but gives examples of photovoltaic power systems, including the Kameyama plant, where the world's largest photovoltaic power system has been installed. More information.	Most LCD TVs meet Energy Star requirements, over 60% of models are at least 30% more energy efficient than the Energy Star baseline, and 25% of models are at least 50% more energy efficient. However, there are no details about the reporting period to which these percentages refer. More 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.