



## SONY ERICSSON Ranking = 5.3/10

Sony Ericsson drops to 4th position with a score of 5.3. It is the first company to score almost top marks on the chemicals criteria, missing this target by having unreasonably high threshold limits for brominated flame retardants in products that are allegedly BFR-free. All SE products are already PVC-free. SE has already met the challenge of the new criterion on chemicals, by banning antimony, beryllium and phthalates from new models launched since January 2008.

The company scores relatively well on energy criteria because all of its products meet and exceed the Energy Star standard. It is now reporting CO2 emissions from its own manufacturing and product transportation.

Sony Ericsson falls down on e-waste issues scoring badly on all the criteria. It reports a pitiful recycling rate of 1%-13%.

## SONY ERICSSON 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				

# SONY ERICSSON 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>PARTIALLY GOOD (2.5+)</b>
Sony Ericsson scores top marks for defining the Precautionary Principle and its commitment to it. <b>More information.</b>	Sony Ericsson is ahead of many companies by already eliminating substances from its new products that others have only identified for future action. <b>More information. SE's pdf List of Banned &amp; Restricted Substances.</b>	All SE products are PVC free – except for cables in a few early models of chargers and accessories, and these are being phased out. All models placed on the market after 1 January 2008 are BFR free, older models may still contain BFRs in circuit boards and substrates. <b>More information. Banned &amp; Restricted Substances.</b>	Antimony, beryllium and phthalates are all listed as banned substances by Sony Ericsson, with a few exemptions for products placed on the market before 1 January 2008. In addition, antimony and its compounds are exempted in solder alloys and when bound in a ceramic matrix. <b>More information.</b>	SE scores 2.5 points (doubled) on this criterion. All SE products are already PVC-free, with the exception of cables in early models of chargers. Since January 2008, all new SE models are BFR-free, but SE's threshold of 1000ppm is too high and needs to be lowered if it is to score full points on this criterion. Older models may still contain BFRs in circuit boards and substrates. <b>More information. Environmental product declarations.</b>

## 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>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>
Sony Ericsson believes in the idea of "taking responsibility for our own products" but there is no explicit support for the principle of Individual Producer Responsibility. <b>More information.</b>	Sony Ericsson does not provide a list of countries where it offers take-back. Instead its Product Declarations inform customers to contact local SE representatives. Testing of SE's take-back by Greenpeace revealed that no take-back services are offered in Thailand, Russia, Argentina or India. It seems the only voluntary programme to which SE refers its US customers to is USEPA's Plug-In to eCycling. <b>More information. Product (Environmental) Declaration. (e.g. J100).</b>	Information on what customers should do with their discarded mobiles is not provided by country. <b>More information.</b> Instead, Product Declarations direct customers to local SE representatives, but no contact is provided. <b>More information. E.g. for J100a.</b>	Sony Ericsson provides estimates of the amount of mobile phones recycled as a percentage of current (not past) sales: 2 - 13% based on sales volume and 1 - 5% based on the number of subscribers. Although this information is collected only for Europe, it is based on data from those countries where mobile phones are collected or reported separately – i.e. Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. <b>More information.</b>	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>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>PARTIALLY BAD (1+)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>BAD (0)</b>	<b>GOOD (3+)</b>
Sony Ericsson signed up in support of the Bali Communiqué, which calls for binding cuts of 50%. It identifies that industrialised countries need to make the greatest effort; however, no targets are specified. For full marks, SE needs to commit to concrete numbers and to industrialised countries cutting by at least 30% by 2020. <b>More information here and here.</b>	Sony Ericsson reports 2007 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from its own manufacturing and product transportation processes of 15 200 tonnes and 228 800 tonnes respectively. <b>More information.</b>	Sony Ericsson's goal to reduce is relative, namely to cut the carbon footprint from its own activities by 15% per unit of production by 2009 and 20% by 2011, based on 2007 figures. No target for reducing absolute emissions is given. <b>More information.</b>	No information on the use of renewable energy is given.	All new models after 2005 meet the requirements of Energy Star, and "...67% are better than the EU CoC power requirements. The standby power is not more than 0.1 W for all new charger models after 2005." <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.