



ACER Ranking = 4.1/10

Acer drops to 12th place from 11th, with the same score of 4.1 points.

Acer scores most points for its efforts on toxic chemicals. It is proactively supporting improvements to the revised EU RoHS Directive (Restriction of Hazardous Substances in electronics); specifically, a methodology for further restrictions of hazardous substances, and an immediate ban on BFRs, chlorinated flame retardants (CFRs) and PVC, for which it scores maximum points. In the last four versions of the ranking, the company has not been penalised for backtracking on its commitment to eliminate PVC and BFRs in all products by the end of 2009; as assurance that this timeline will be met, Acer launched four new PVC and BFR-free models of notebook in January 2010; four more notebooks have just been launched, together with a monitor, and Acer plans to launch more monitors and a desktop shortly. Acer now needs to transition all its products to using no BFRs and PVC. Acer's new plan is to phase out PVC vinyl plastic and brominated flame retardants (BFRs) for personal and mobile computing products by 2011 rather than for all products – and therefore scores only one point. The company is rewarded for its commitment to phase out all phthalates, beryllium and compounds and antimony and compounds in all new products by 2012.

Acer scores poorly on e-waste, even though it is reporting a recycling rate of 29.8 percent based on past sales, for desktops and notebooks, but only those sold and recycled in Taiwan. Acer needs to clarify its support, and do more lobbying, for Individual Producer Responsibility, extend its voluntary take-back and recycling programme beyond India, and start sourcing recycled plastic.

Acer does a little better on the energy criteria, supporting global cuts in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of at least 50 percent by 2050 and 30 percent by 2020 from industrialised countries (compared to 1990 levels) and calling for global GHG emissions to peak by 2015. Acer needs to set a target for absolute cuts in GHG emissions, which is now overdue, and start sourcing renewable energy. On energy efficiency, Acer reports that, at present, 63 percent of notebook PCs and 40.6 percent of desktop PCs meet the new Energy Star v.5 standard; previously, 55 percent of Acer notebook PCs and 29 percent of desktop PCs met the standard.

ACER Overall Score

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

ACER Detailed Scoring

Chemicals

Precautionary Principle and support for revision of RoHS Directive.	Chemicals Management	Timeline for PVC & BFR phaseout	Timeline for additional substances phaseout	PVC-free and/or BFR-free models (double points)
GOOD (3+)	GOOD (3+)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	GOOD (3+)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)
<p>Acer's statement on the precautionary principle recognises the need for preventive action, even if scientific evidence is not conclusive. More information here and here.</p> <p>Acer is proactively supporting a ban on organo - chlorine and bromine substances in the revision of RoHS 2.0 and scores maximum points for providing evidence of actively promoting this position to EU decision makers. More information here and here.</p>	<p>Top marks for describing the mechanisms for identifying future substances of concern.</p> <p>Supply chain management.</p> <p>HSF (Hazardous Substance Free) Planning.</p>	<p>Acer has a new timeline and roadmap for eliminating PVC and BFRs of 2011, which now applies only to personal and mobile computing products; its previous commitment applied to all products, therefore its score is reduced.</p> <p>More information.</p> <p>Availability of key components prevented Acer from meeting its original commitment to phase out PVC and BFRs in all products by the end of 2009. Four new PVC/BFR free models of notebook were launched in January 2010 and other products have followed. More information here, here and here.</p> <p>Technology assessment results.</p>	<p>Acer has adopted a timeline of 2012 for the phase out of all phthalates, beryllium and compounds and antimony and compounds in all new products. Certain phthalates are to be phased out by 2009.</p> <p>More information.</p>	<p>It is encouraging to see that Acer has introduced more models that are free of PVC and BFRs in Q3 2010; four notebooks, apart from external cables (TravelMate 8172T, 8372T, 8472T and 8572) and an LCD monitor (C233HL); two more monitors are planned for October 2010 (C203HL) and December 2010 (C193HQL) and a desktop (apart from external cables) is planned for December 2010.</p> <p>More information. In Q1 2010 Acer launched a new Timeline series notebook, Aspire 3811TZ, 3811TQG, 3811T, 3811TG, made with materials free from PVC and BFRs. More information here and here.</p>

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
PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	BAD (0)
<p>Acer supports IPR and "believes that this will place 'easily recyclable design considerations' as an important feedback mechanism directly reflected in product design". To score more points, Acer needs to clarify that support for IPR means full internalisation and transparent feedback of its products real end-of-life costs, ie through differentiated financing that accounts for each brand separately (e.g. no longer collective financing such as market share but instead more real and individualised financing such as return share). Acer also needs to provide examples of where it is doing advocacy and details of operationalisation of IPR.</p> <p>More information.</p>	<p>Acer provides take-back services where required to do so by national EPR laws. The only exception seems to be India where Acer now takes back and recycles for free. It is unclear if Acer provides take-back in some US states and Canadian provinces, as the links provided are to NGOs and EPA's Plug in to e-cycling. To score points, Acer needs to extend the coverage of its take-back services. More information.</p>	<p>Recycling information provided for EU, Japanese, Taiwanese and Indian customers only. Information for US customers needs to be more relevant. In the EU, some of the links provided navigate to trade associations (e.g. France, Czech Republic) and not to recyclers.</p> <p>More information.</p> <p>Europe.</p> <p>Taiwan.</p> <p>Japan.</p> <p>India.</p>	<p>Acer reports a recycling rate of 29.47% in 2008 based on sales 6 years ago, for desktops and notebooks sold and recycled in Taiwan. However, the data is only for Taiwan and relies on many assumptions. More information.</p>	<p>Acer uses a material containing 28% post-consumer recycled plastic in monitor casings of 7 families of EPEAT Gold models. The recycled plastic percentage will be around 10%-13% of all plastics used in the monitor, however, Acer does not currently report its use of recycled plastics as a percentage of all plastics use. Acer intends to draw up a phase-in plan with a detailed schedule and targets.</p> <p>More information.</p>

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)
GOOD (3+)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)	BAD (0)	BAD (0)	PARTIALLY BAD (1+)
<p>Acer supports the reduction targets proposed by the EU, which are to cut GHG emissions by at least 50% by 2050 globally and 30% by 2020 from industrialised countries (compared to 1990 levels). Acer gets full marks for supporting calls for global GHG emissions to peak by 2015.</p> <p>More information.</p>	<p>Acer reports on GHG emissions from its global operations that in total were 47,644 CO₂ equivalent tonnes in 2007 and 45,959 CO₂ -e tonnes in 2008. Scope 1 and 2 emissions are reported, as well as business travel in Scope 3. Acer has requested its suppliers to respond to the Supply Chain Leadership Collaboration (SCLC) questionnaire of the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). A preliminary figure from suppliers allocated to Acer was about 82,000 CO₂ equivalent tonnes in 2008. Acer reports that data collection and verification for 2009 was conducted in the second quarter of 2010, however, these are not available and there is no explanation for the delay. To score more points, Acer needs to provide external verification of its calculations. More information.</p>	<p>Acer expects to finalise its short-term, mid-term and long term GHG reduction targets in 2009, which is now well overdue. This was already delayed as previously Acer expected to finalize its mid-and long-term GHG reduction targets in winter 2008.</p> <p>More information.</p>	<p>A global survey was conducted in 2008 on purchasing renewable energy. Acer is also assessing the feasibility of using renewable energy such as solar power and wind power in its global operations. Acer needs to update its website with the results of this survey and set targets for its use of renewable energy.</p> <p>More information.</p>	<p>63.2% of notebook PCs and 40.6% of desktop PCs meet the new Energy Star v.5 standard. Acer has recently updated these figures. Computers need to leave the factory with the highest settings for energy efficiency.</p> <p>More information.</p>

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 first criterion has been sharpened to require companies not only to have a chemicals policy underpinned by the Precautionary Principle, but also to support a revision of the RoHS Directive that bans further harmful substances, specifically BFRs, chlorinated flame retardants (CFRs) and PVC. The criterion on Chemicals Management remains 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. In the fourteenth edition the criteria for the Precautionary Principle was made more challenging.

For the latest version greenpeace.org/greenelectronics

Toshiba, Samsung, LGE, Dell and Lenovo continue to be penalised in this latest version of the Guide for backtracking on their commitments to phase out vinyl plastic (PVC) and brominated flame retardants (BFRs). Toshiba is served with a further penalty point for misleading its customers and Greenpeace by not admitting that it would not meet its commitment. In addition, Microsoft is served with a penalty point for the first time for backtracking on its commitment to phase out PVC and BFRs by the end of 2010.