

## 29 IT Brands' Responses and Consumers' Green Choice

Friends of Nature Institute of Public and Environmental Affairs Green Beagle

June 5, 2010

Since 2009, a series of heavy metal pollution incidents spurred great concern from society and has brought the problem of heavy metal pollution to a higher level of awareness. In April 2010, based on extensive research, Friends of Nature, the Institute of Public and Environmental Affairs, Green Beagle, and 34 environmental NGOs had exchanges with 29 well-known IT brands in a larger call for IT companies to have stronger control over heavy metals. We hope that these IT brands realize the importance of heavy metal discharge problems resulting from IT production processes and hope they take measures to strengthen their environmental management system.

Our research report was released on April 26, 2010 in a "Heavy Metal Pollution Prevention and Social Responsibility of IT Companies" workshop held by "Environmental Protection" magazine to promote awareness and concern for heavy metal pollution in all members of society. By May 26<sup>th</sup>, the number of IT brand companies that responded grew from 8 to 21 brands, which showed positive progress, since facing this problem showed important initiative on behalf of the companies to resolve this serious issue. To conscientiously promote IT brands to recognize this problem and then turn that understanding into action, we conducted a 2<sup>nd</sup> round of communications with the 21 brands based on their initial responses through written exchanges, phone calls, and meetings.

### **The second round of communication incorporates these main aspects:**

1. Some companies said they were carrying out investigations.

We expressed our hope that the companies would make a timely disclosure of internal investigation results.

2. Some brand companies claimed that the companies environmental NGOs have listed as exceeding environmental standards are not "direct suppliers" or "first tier suppliers."

Given that IT production relies heavily on outsourcing, we believe that it is not sufficient to extend environmental management only to first tier suppliers; rather, environmental management needs to be extended further down through the supply chain.

We therefore hope the corporation can confirm if related companies are part of their supply chain.

3. Some brand companies claimed that the companies that environmental NGOs have listed as exceeding environmental standards are "not currently their suppliers."

Considering some companies' non-compliant behavior happened in past years we hope that these companies can confirm if related companies used to be their suppliers.

4. Some IT brand companies mentioned that they have introduced certain supplier environmental / social responsibility management standards, including the industry's volunteer standards such as the "Electronics Industry Code of Conduct."

We hope the company can clarify how these measures and standards would be implemented and to confirm if the implementation of standards like "Electronics Industry Code of Conduct" would be sufficient to ensure timely and effective identification of violations by suppliers.

5. Most brand companies seemed to be unsure of how they could improve their existing management system.

We explained to them the progress that China has made in recent years in better environmental information disclosure; and introduced the best practices by other companies of textile, machinery, food and chemical industry that began to take advantage of open government enforcement information to improve their supply chain management. We want the IT brand companies to clearly confirm if they will consider using public government data in their supply chain management.

Based on the results of the second round of communications we had with 29 IT brand companies, we have updated the "IT Brand Reply Fact Sheet"<sup>1</sup>

Company Name	Replied to NGO Letter	Checked the Purpose of the Study	Conducted Checks on Supplier Violation Cases		Use Public Information to Enhance Supply Chain Management	
			Initial Checks	In-depth Checks	Consider Establishing a Search Mechanism	Decided to Establish a Search Mechanism
Samsung	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
HP	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
Panasonic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
Toshiba	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X
Siemens	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X
Sanyo	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
Haier	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
Lenovo	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
TCL	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
Intel	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
Hitachi	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
Sony	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
Alcatel-Lucent	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
Cisco	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
Seiko Epson	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
Nokia	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
British Telecom	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
Sharp	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
Sing Tel	✓	✓	X	X	X	X
Motorola	✓	X	X	X	X	X
Foxconn	✓	X	X	X	X	X
Apple	X	X	X	X	X	X
Philips	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ericsson	X	X	X	X	X	X
Vodafone	X	X	X	X	X	X
IBM	X	X	X	X	X	X
Canon	X	X	X	X	X	X
LG	X	X	X	X	X	X
BYD	X	X	X	X	X	X

<sup>1</sup> The fact sheet is made based on information collected by June 4, 2010

Through analysis, we can see that the reactions by different IT brands have further diversified:

1. More IT Brands have made initial responses to NGOs' requests to strengthen their suppliers' environmental management
2. Of the companies that gave positive replies, a few leading companies have started to take action.
3. Some companies' responses were limited to confirming the cases cited by NGOs for violations of heavy metal standards, however they had an inadequate understanding of the importance to make a systemic improvement of supply chain management.
4. Some companies obviously attempted to get rid of the questions as soon as possible. They did not want to learn the background of heavy metal pollution or the efforts made by stakeholders in China to control this pollution.
5. Some companies only responded that they received the letter and some said they would follow up on this, but by June 4<sup>th</sup> 2010 there were still no responses.
6. 8 European, American, Japanese, Korean and Chinese mainland companies did not respond.

IT brand responses can be divided into 5 categories of "response status:" solid response, limited response, initial response, insubstantial response, and no response.

Solid Responses	Limited Responses	Initial Responses	Insubstantial Responses	No Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Samsung</li> <li>• HP</li> <li>• Panasonic</li> <li>• Siemens</li> <li>• Toshiba</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sanyo</li> <li>• Haier</li> <li>• Lenovo</li> <li>• TCL</li> <li>• Intel</li> <li>• Hitachi</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sony</li> <li>• Alcatel-Lucent</li> <li>• Cisco</li> <li>• Seiko</li> <li>• Epson</li> <li>• Nokia</li> <li>• BT</li> <li>• Sharp</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sing Tel</li> <li>• Motorola</li> <li>• Foxconn</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apple</li> <li>• Philips</li> <li>• Ericsson</li> <li>• Vodafone</li> <li>• IBM</li> <li>• Canon</li> <li>• LG</li> <li>• BYD</li> </ul>

Solid Responses: Samsung, Hewlett-Packard, Panasonic, Siemens, and Toshiba

The companies listed above all conducted investigation of cases cited by NGOs and among them Samsung, Hewlett-Packard and Panasonic carried out in-depth investigations. They were all willing to consider using public government enforcement records to strengthen their supply chain's environmental management.

Limited Responses: Sanyo, Haier, Lenovo, TCL, Intel, and Hitachi

The companies above are cases that have submitted investigation results to the NGOs. They have also expressed their understanding of the requirements made by NGOs for them to strengthen environmental management of their supply chain.

Initial Responses: Sony, Alcatel-Lucent, Cisco, Seiko Epson, Nokia, British Telecom, and Sharp

The company cases above are limited to having initial investigations, and are not willing to respond as to how to make systemic changes in their supply chain management so as to solve the existence of heavy metal pollution and other environmental problems of IT product manufacturing.

Insubstantial Responses: Singapore Telecommunications, Motorola, and Foxconn

The above companies responded that they received the NGO letter but have not followed up since.

No Response: Apple, Philips, Ericsson, Vodafone, IBM, Canon, LG, and BYD

Apple, Philips, Ericsson, Vodafone, IBM, Canon, LG and BYD made no response at all to the NGO's questions on heavy metal pollution.

**What should or could be done by the public in reaction to those IT brands who declined to respond?**

Many people through the Internet and mail expressed their surprise, sadness and anger at the cases of the production of IT products, which continue to violate environmental standards and harm public health. Though there was a widespread sense of helplessness, we heard people raising the question: what can I do? Can I influence and change the company's corporate behavior?

We believe that through making green choices, the public has the influence to change these enterprises. The further diversification of the responses by IT brands, which is documented in this report, means the public can make better green choices as consumers.

To those businesses that have refused to respond, we advocate that consumers of their products to express their expectations and require that they strengthen their supply chain management and control the production processes that generate heavy metal discharge.

**If you are willing to understand the necessity and feasibility to express your feelings and opinions to the IT brand companies, please refer to these question and answers:**

- Why should we care about the IT industry's heavy metal discharges?

The public should care because the manufacturing process of IT products creates heavy metal discharge that will bring serious and long-lasting damage to the environment and public health.

- Are there solutions to control heavy metals in the IT industry?

Yes. In the production process of PCB (printed circuit boards), there is a mature solution to control heavy metal pollution. This is to simply install equipment at the end of the production process that can effectively recover heavy metals.

- Why is it so important for the IT industry for IT brands to get involved in the control of heavy metal discharge in their supply chain?

IT brand products are primarily produced through OEM processing enterprises. If IT brands only ask about quality and price in their sourcing practice, not about their environmental performance, it pushes suppliers to reduce costs at the expense of environmental standards in order to increase business. Conversely, if the IT brands integrate environmental protection requirements in their sourcing code, they could promote suppliers to improve their environmental performance.

- Why do we need to promote consumer participation in pollution control for the IT industry?

We need to promote consumer participation in IT industry pollution because consumers are the most important stakeholders for IT brands. Consumers' clear expression of their desire for pollution control would be a great driving force for IT

brands to take action.

- Why do IT brands have the responsibility to respond to my expectations and demands?

Most of these brands have made an environmental protection commitment one way or another, which means that if you buy their product, you are also purchasing a commitment. IT brands rely heavily on outsourcing their production and if suppliers are left unchecked and violate environmental rules and standards, the brands violate their commitment. As a consumer of their products, you have the right to require open explanations on their behavior and corrective actions.

- Are there cases where major brand companies have successfully helped suppliers to eliminate pollution?

Yes. China has made significant progress in environmental transparency in recent years. The pollution map database now contains over 60,000 corporate violation records from government sources. This allows brands to easily compare their list of suppliers with government issued non-compliant records. Currently GE, Nike, Wal-Mart, Esquel, Unilever, Mitsui Property and others have already started to use the database to track the performance of their suppliers in China. Through regular screening, more than one hundred companies with violation records have felt pressure over the past months and they have publicly disclosed their problems and corrective measures. Among these companies quite a few have also been through independent audits under the supervision of 34 local NGOs who joined the Green Choice Alliance program.<sup>2</sup>

As noted above, currently Samsung, HP, Panasonic, Toshiba and other IT companies have made attempts to use public enforcement records for monitoring and managing their supply chain. But the lion's share of IT brands is still taking a wait-and-see attitude. Perhaps they are waiting for the final signal, that is, a clear-cut message from the consumers. For the ecological environment and public health, and to leave our children with safe and inhabitable land, please raise your voice!

---

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to <http://en.ipe.org.cn/news/index.jsp> for audit reports and other relevant documents.

If you would like to send requests and comments to the 8 companies who did not respond, try using the following websites:

### **Apple**

Chinese Link: <http://www.apple.com.cn/contact/feedback.html>

English Link: <http://www.apple.com/contact/feedback.html>

### **IBM**

Chinese Link: <https://www-900.ibm.com/cn/complaint/>

English Link: <http://www.ibm.com/scripts/contact/contact/us/en>

### **Canon**

Chinese Address: [webmaster@canon.com.cn](mailto:webmaster@canon.com.cn)

English Address:

[http://www.canon-asia.com/section/sales\\_service\\_contact/?cat=0&region=126](http://www.canon-asia.com/section/sales_service_contact/?cat=0&region=126)

English Link: [https://secure1.canon.com/ssl-form/environment\\_form-e.html](https://secure1.canon.com/ssl-form/environment_form-e.html)

Japanese Link: <https://secure1.canon.jp/feedback/form.html>

### **LG**

Email: [lgpr@lge.com](mailto:lgpr@lge.com)

Or Chinese Address: <http://www.lg.com/cn/support/contact/support-send-a-message.jsp>

### **Ericsson**

English Link: <http://www.ericsson.com/feedback>

### **Philips**

English Link:

[http://www.support.philips.com/support/contact/contact\\_page.jsp;jsessionid=957057E4DCF7B73B915DDC13C5FE82D1.app106-drp2?userCountry=us&userLanguage=en](http://www.support.philips.com/support/contact/contact_page.jsp;jsessionid=957057E4DCF7B73B915DDC13C5FE82D1.app106-drp2?userCountry=us&userLanguage=en)

### **Vodafone**

English Link: [http://www.vodafone.com/start/responsibility/investor\\_contactso.html](http://www.vodafone.com/start/responsibility/investor_contactso.html)

### **BYD**

Chinese Address: [bydhongkong@byd.com.cn](mailto:bydhongkong@byd.com.cn)

If you have problems with submitting, please contact the following nearest environmental organizations, and we'll help you submit your comments.

Organization	Contact Person	Phone Numbers	Email Address	Location	Website
<b>Friends of Nature</b>	Zhang Hehe	13641317805	zhanghehe@fonchina.org	Beijing	www.fon.org.cn
<b>The Youth Environmental Association in Chongqing</b>	Xiang Chun	15923569322	xgou.zi@163.com	Chongqing	www.cqyea.org
<b>Wenzhou Green Eyes</b>	Wen Meicheng	020-85811404	scns@greeneyeschina.org	Guangzhou, Guangdong	www.greeneyeschina.org
<b>Green Longjiang</b>	Zhang Yadong	13796626785	zhangyadonghaobang@126.com	Harbin, Heilongjiang	www.greenljngo.cn
<b>Green Student Forum</b>	Zhang Xiao	13810881392	zhx_317@126.com	Beijing	www.gsfchina.org
<b>Green Finger</b>	Liu Meichen	15120093326	765218580@qq.com	Beijing	
<b>Nanjing Green Stone Environmental Action Network</b>	Li Chunhua	13701472216	info@green-stone.org	Nanjing, Jiangsu	www.green-stone.org
<b>Center for Rural Development and Biodiversity Protection of Lanzhou University</b>	Luo Xiao	13919322466	luoxiaocd@sina.com	Lanzhou, Gansu	
<b>Green Water Shed</b>	Xiang Hongmei	0871-4182395	hmxiang@163.com	Kunming, Yunnan	www.greenwatershed.org
<b>Green Beagle</b>	He Xiaoxia	13681521731	hxx7813@sina.com	Beijing	www.bjep.org.cn
<b>Institute of Public and Environmental Affairs</b>	Wu Wei	010-67136387	wwthunder@gmail.com	Beijing	www.ipe.org.cn

## Appendix I:

The 29 IT company responses are as follows:

### 1. Solid Responses: Samsung, Hewlett-Packard, Panasonic, Siemens and Toshiba

The companies listed above all conducted investigation of cases cited by NGOs and among them Samsung, Hewlett-Packard and Panasonic carried out in-depth investigations. They were all willing to consider using public government enforcement records to strengthen their supply chain's environmental management.

#### Samsung Corporation:

Since April 28, 2010 Samsung contacted us by phone quite a few times, and on May 7, 2010, Samsung headquarters replied:

1. Of the 5 companies that NGO listed as having environmental violations, Samsung no longer does business with 4 of them. The remaining company is a second and third tier supplier.
2. Samsung already confirmed with the company in 2008 and in 2009 that they had environmental violations. Samsung also believed that the violations have been resolved. Samsung has warned the company to strictly abide by China's environmental laws and related regulations. We thank your organization for providing good information.
3. In the future, we will take strong measures to ensure that this company will not violate environmental regulations or our company will end business with the company. In addition, we have directly contacted the Tier 2 supplier that purchases from the Tier 3 supplier with violation records, requiring them to strengthen their supervision and management. If further environmental violations were identified in the future then we will end business relationship with both the Tier 2 and Tier 3 suppliers.
4. When responding to our questions about if any more suppliers with environmental compliance problems exist, Samsung reiterates its confirmation to the NGOs that Samsung is making a check and will push for corrective actions once such violations are identified.
5. Since 2004, Samsung has gone through the Eco-Partner certification system, to detect suppliers of components and raw hazardous materials, and to evaluate the environmental management system and manufacturing processes to award certificates to our suppliers that meet requirements; they are not certified by enterprises that do business with them.

China Samsung has strived to become a company that contributes to Chinese people and society.

On May 12, 2010 Suzhou Samsung called hoping to receive a list of auditors that were recognized by IPE for carrying out the third party audits. Suzhou Samsung stated that it would encourage the supplier to do a third party audit. Suzhou Samsung said it is now using IPE's database to retrieve the environmental behavior of its suppliers in response to a previous letter sent to Samsung by IPE, which encouraged them to do a check of their suppliers' non-compliance records. The process by Suzhou Samsung is as follows: first they must show the government the eligibility of the company's non-compliance records and then allow them to conduct a third party audit.

IPE expressed its hope for Suzhou Samsung to encourage its suppliers with violation records to explain about their past infractions and make appropriate information disclosure.

On May 14, 2010, Samsung inquired how to help suppliers make improvements, and on May 17, NGO groups responded.

Samsung inquired how to help suppliers make improvements, and on May 17, NGO groups responded.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received Samsung's updated information on the results of supplier screening.

#### **Hewlett-Packard:**

HP made a few phone calls to NGOs, confirming that one of the manufacturers cited by NGOs was one of its second tier suppliers. HP stated that it would contact first tier suppliers to clarify the corrections and compliance that has been made on the cited case. HP also informed that the other manufacturer cited by the NGO was not its supplier. HP checked about how to use the database for environmental management, and NGOs showed them how brands from other industries use the database for their supply chain management, such as provide links to related materials (enterprise feedback, disclosure of updated monitoring results and discharge data, etc.). HP wishes that IPE could provide models and cases for them to share with the first tier suppliers. On May 24, 2010, NGO group sent HP models of HP related cases.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received HP's updated information on its screening results.

#### **Panasonic:**

Since April 15, 2010, Panasonic has tried to reach NGO groups by phone. Following in-depth investigations, on April 30, 2010, Panasonic provided a written explanation. Panasonic explained that they had started to use the China Water Pollution Map for supplier management, and that they are considering the establishment of further management mechanisms.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received Panasonic's updated information on the investigation results.

#### **Siemens:**

On May 12, 2010, after the initial investigation, Siemens provided a written explanation.

On May 17, environmental organizations responded, addressing the following four points:

1. To raise questions about the results of Siemens' initial investigation
2. In view of the company's past non-compliance, we hope that we can confirm whether these companies are Siemens' suppliers.
3. Siemens monitored four suppliers timely and effectively and discovered that their suppliers exceeded environmental standards.
4. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared with Sony best practice cases by other industries by using the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Siemens can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.
  - On June 2, a representative from Siemens met with NGO representatives and exchanged viewpoints on supply chain management. Siemens showed the results of the initial investigation as well as the company's supply chain management policies and measures. NGO representatives in turn described the research project on heavy metal pollution, and gave a demonstration of how to use the governments'

environmental regulation database to conduct supply chain management. The Siemens representative took these points seriously and concluded that the data was valuable.

- On June 4, Siemens sent a letter to the NGO organizations saying they will combine their currently used information with government department information to further understand their suppliers' true environmental performance, and said, "we do consider using your public data in this regard."

✧ On June 4, 2010, NGO organizations replied to Siemens and looks forward to hearing their search results.

#### **Toshiba:**

Since April 26, 2010, Toshiba had a number of exchanges with NGO groups. On May 17, Toshiba wrote a letter saying, "We deeply understand the importance of implementing environmental management in the entire supply chain and in the future will implement proper supplier management. In addition, we will provide corrective guidance to any suppliers found to be violating environmental regulation. We will also refer to your database as described in your letter."

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received Toshiba's updated information on the screening results.

#### **2. Limited Responses: Sanyo, Haier, Lenovo, TCL, Intel, and Hitachi.**

The companies above are cases that have submitted investigation results to the NGO to be verified. They have also expressed a desire for a better understanding of requirements needed to strengthen environmental management of their supply chain.

#### **Sanyo:**

On April 21, 2010, Sanyo China made phone contact with NGOs. NGO organizations explained to Sanyo the background and purpose of their project and informed Sanyo that through the searchable database they could retrieve the environmental monitoring records of their supplier companies and its suppliers could update the public on their performance by posting enterprise feedback, recent monitoring results and discharge data. Sanyo China said they would send a proposal to headquarters about the need to establish a mechanism to conduct regular checks on its supply chain.

- On April 26, 2010, One of Sanyo's suppliers sent relative information, and IPE added it to the China Water Pollution Map.

✧ As of June 4, 2010 we have not yet received Sanyo's explanations for three other companies, and has not yet received Sanyo's response from the supply chain regarding the establishment of a screening mechanism.

#### **Haier:**

On April 23, 2010 Haier said that their internal investigation had already been done and said that Haier was an important buyer of the companies mentioned in the NGO's letter. NGOs explained their background and purpose of the project and informed Haier that they could retrieve the environmental monitoring records of their supplier companies, and its suppliers could update the public on their performance by posting enterprise feedback, recent monitoring results and discharge data. Haier said

they would have active communication with the cited supplier and to encourage suppliers to make contact with NGOs.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received any updates from Haier.

**Lenovo:**

On April 23, 2010, after the initial inspection, Lenovo provided written explanations that they conducted relevant investigations and confirmed that the company mentioned in the letter was not their supplier. Lenovo said they would have further communication on the following two questions the NGOs mentioned in the latter part of the letter:

1. Do you have any other suppliers that have problems with environmental compliance?
2. Do you have environmental standards for your suppliers? Have you established an environmental management system for your supply chain?

✧ As of June 4, 2010 we have not received any responses to the two questions above.

**TCL:**

On May 6, 2010 after the initial investigation, TCL provided written explanations, and said the company mentioned by the NGO's letter was not their supplier.

On May 7, 2010, environmental organizations wrote a follow up response, addressing the following points:

1. Ask whether TCL had conducted an in-depth investigation, and if so, to ask for the results of the investigation.
2. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope TCL can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not received any response from TCL.

**Intel:**

After the initial inspection, on May 19, 2010 Intel provided a written explanation.

On May 20, environmental organizations responded, addressing the following three points:

1. In view of the IT industry's outsourcing of production at every level, we hope that Intel can confirm whether these violators are part of their supply chain.
2. Intel confirmed that the cited companies were not their suppliers but informed us that another PCB manufacturer that belongs to the same group company is its supplier. Intel added that the supplier had a written confirmation of environmental compliance. NGOs thanked Intel for informing them, but informed Intel that the supplier had several infraction records on the China Water Pollution Map database, and suggested that Intel verify if corrective measures were in place. NGOs also hope that Intel could explain the ways they check supplier compliance.
3. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Intel can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ As of June 4, 2010 we have not received Intels' response to the three questions above.

#### Hitachi:

From April 15, to April 30, 2010 the company called to get in contact with us a few times, confirming that Hitachi had business relationship with four companies cited by NGOs. Hitachi explained that they had not known about their suppliers' pollution problems, and that if it were true, they would require the companies to take corrective measures. Hitachi recognized that they did not know whether other suppliers had such problems. It also described Hitachi's corporate responsibility and green procurement. Environmental organizations introduced how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Hitachi can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management. Hitachi managers said they would convey this message to their leadership, provide written evidence and make further communications

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not received any further feedback from Hitachi.

### 3. Initial Responses: Sony, Alcatel-Lucent, Cisco, Seiko Epson, Nokia, Sharp, and British Telecom

The company cases above are limited to having initial investigations, and are not willing to respond as to how to make systemic changes in their supply chain management so as to solve the existence of heavy metal pollution and other environmental problems of IT product manufacturing.

#### Sony:

After the initial investigation, on April 19, 2010 Sony provided a written explanation.

On April 20, 2010, environmental organizations responded addressing the following points:

1. To raise questions on the results of Sony's initial investigation.
2. In view that the violations occurred in recent years, to confirm whether any of the cited companies used to be Sony's suppliers.
3. We hope that Sony can confirm if any of the cited companies were its second tier suppliers.
4. We appreciate that Sony has demanded for their suppliers to achieve environmental compliance but we want Sony to explain how they check the status of suppliers' compliance.
5. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Sony can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ On April 28, 2010, Sony sent a letter to the environmental organizations, repeating the statement in their first response, arguing that the 10 companies that the environmental groups listed as having illegal excessive discharge of heavy metals were absolutely not their "direct suppliers" and that if any of Sony's they were second tier suppliers were found to breach the "Sony Supplier Code of Conduct" that Sony would cooperate with the first tier suppliers to require compliance, but because of the complexity of their supply chain, Sony could not know every single supplier and that they do not have

a list of their secondary suppliers.

**Alcatel-Lucent:**

On May 5, 2010, after the initial investigation, Alcatel-Lucent provided a written explanation.

On May 7, 2010, environmental organizations responded, addressing the following three points:

1. To raise questions about the results of Alcatel-Lucent's initial investigation.
2. Ask about Alcatel-Lucent's environmental management and whether they have other suppliers that have problems with environmental compliance.
3. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Alcatel-Lucent can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received Alcatel-Lucent's response to the three questions above.

**Seiko Epson:**

On May 7, 2010 after the initial investigation, Seiko Epson provided a written explanation.

On May 17, environmental organizations responded, addressing the following four points:

1. Given that Seiko Epson's response stressed that, "Our and our related company never had direct business with these companies" and promised that, "we will confirm whether we've had secondary transactions with these companies" Has Epson found out now whether these companies are their secondary suppliers?
2. In view that the violations by suppliers occurred in recent years, to confirm whether any of the cited companies used to be Sony's suppliers.
3. In view that the IT industry relies heavily on outsourcing production, we hope that Seiko Epson will extend environmental management to their supply chain, and that they will confirm the existence of any other environmental violations.
4. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Seiko Epson can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not received Seiko Epson's response to the four questions above.

**Nokia:**

On May 10, 2010, after the initial investigation, Nokia provided a written explanation.

On May 17, environmental organizations responded addressing the following five points:

1. To raise questions about the results of Nokia's initial investigation.
2. In view that the violations by suppliers occurred in recent years, to confirm whether any of the cited companies used to be Sony's suppliers.
3. In view of the IT industry's outsourcing of production at every level, IPE hopes that Nokia can confirm whether these violators are part of their supply chain.
4. Agree with Nokia's position to extend environmental management down through the supply chain but ask about their approach and implementation of the system.

5. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope Nokia can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received Nokia's response to the questions above.

#### **British Telecom:**

On May 10, 2010, after an initial investigation, British Telecom provided a written explanation.

On May 17, environmental organizations responded, addressing the following four points:

1. To raise questions about the results of British Telecom's initial investigation
2. BT said the company had no direct purchasing relationship with the violators and that now they are not purchasing from these companies. So we would like BT to confirm whether any of these violating companies have been part of their supply chain.
3. Agree with BT's criteria that suppliers shall comply with environmental law, and ask how BT checks the compliance status of its suppliers.
4. To introduce how environmental information disclosure has created new opportunities for environmental management in the supply chain, and shared best practice cases from other industries that used the database to strengthen environmental management. NGOs hope BT can confirm whether it will consider using publicly available government information to improve suppliers' environmental management.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received BT's response to the above four questions.

#### **Sharp:**

On April 28, 2010, Sharp sent an email from its headquarters saying that its Procurement Department is finding out whether the companies listed by the NGOs were their suppliers, and said they will reply with the findings as soon as possible.

✧ As late as June 4, 2010, we received a fax from Sharp China, confirming that one of the companies with violation records has direct business relations with a subsidiary company of Sharp.

#### **4. Insubstantial Responses: Singapore Telecommunications, Motorola, and Foxconn**

The above companies responded that they received the NGO letter but have not followed up since.

#### **Singapore Telecommunications:**

On April 22, 2010, Singapore Telecommunications made three calls to NGO groups. NGOs responded and explained their project background and how to use existing environmental information data for environmental management. Singapore Telecommunications said as a publicly listed company, they would give group-level feedback.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not yet received any further feedback from Singapore

Telecommunications.

**Motorola:**

On May 4, 2010, Motorola sent a letter to NGOs, saying, "We are investigating whether these companies are Motorola's suppliers."

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not received any further information from Motorola.

**Foxconn:**

On May 17, 2010, Foxconn had the NGO letter at its headquarters. Foxconn China said they had pass the NGO letter to the Group headquarter in Taiwan and stated that they were not sure if the Group headquarter would respond to NGOs.

✧ As of June 4, 2010, we have not received any feedback from Foxconn.

**5. No Response: Apple, Philips, Ericsson, Vodafone, IBM, Canon, LG, and BYD**

Apple, Philips, Ericsson, Vodafone, IBM, Canon, LG and BYD made no response at all to the NGO's questions on heavy metal pollution.

**Philips:**

34 environmental NGOs sent a letter to Philips Global Website on April 21, 2010, raising questions about Philips' supply chain environment management in China. NGOs received an automatic response right after from Philips Global Website saying that a written response would be provided in 4 working days. However, as of June 4, 2010, environmental NGOs have yet to receive any direct response from Philips. Considering that no further response was made by Philips, the environmental organizations have decided not to recognize the automatic response from Philips Global Website as a formal response from the company.

## Appendix II

<b>NGO Members of Green Choice Alliance</b>	
1	Friends of Nature
2	Global Village Beijing
3	Green Earth Volunteers
4	Global Environmental Institute
5	Huai River Water Living Circumstance Scientific Research Center
6	Gansu Green Camel Bell
7	Friends of Green in Tianjin
8	Beijing Promotion Association for Sustainable Development
9	Center for Legal Assistance to Pollution Victims
10	Chongqing Green Volunteer Federation
11	Nanjing Green Stone Environmental Action Network
12	Nature Watcher Volunteer
13	Hubei Green Hanjiang
14	Environment Protection Commonwealth Association
15	Xinjiang Conservation Funds
16	Hebei Green Friend Association
17	Yunnan Green Watershed
18	Wenzhou Green Eyes
19	Wild China
20	Green Island
21	Green Beagle
22	Shanghai Oasis Ecological Conservation and Communication Center
23	Volunteers Association of Red Phoenix Project in Shaanxi
24	Friends Of Green Environment
25	Green Longjiang
26	Green Anhui
27	Green Zhujiang
28	Green River
29	Dalian Environmental Resource Center
30	Center for Rural Development and Biodiversity Protection of Lanzhou University
31	South China Nature Society
32	Green Kunming
33	The Youth Environmental Association in Chongqing
34	Institute of Public and Environmental Affairs