

1.



GOING GREEN !
And what that may mean to telecom

趋向绿化！
对于电信业意味着什么

- The telecom industry in general is in the early phase of defining what "going green" means!
- Making one's product offerings more environmentally conscious can have a more meaningful impact on a company's competitive position!

- 电信业普遍处于如何定义“趋向绿化”的早期阶段！
- 让产品融入更多的环保意识，对于提高企业的市场竞争地位具有深远的影响！

When “going green” sometimes means having large polluters pay for lavish advertisements focused on how much they care about the earth, it helps to look beyond platitudes to tangible specifics.

Right now, the telecom industry in general is in the early phase of defining what “going green” means, according to analyst Jason Marcheck at Current Analysis.

“ ‘Green’ is almost too diffuse a term and, repeated too often, it begins to lose its meaning.” said Marcheck. “Everyone is at the beginning of the process, trying to figure out how powerful this is going to be, where the shortcomings are and, as an analyst, I have to cover it. We’re all in the same boat.”

Morphing into green initiatives

Vendors have been asking for help in discerning the difference between traditional notions of lower total cost of ownership (TCO) and actual green initiatives, the analyst said. Lowering the TCO by lowering the energy consumption of a piece of equipment, say telecom infrastructure, is a traditional notion, Marcheck said. So it bears examining where that practice morphs into a green initiative.

Perception is important. Because telecom and information technology make up one of the largest business sectors in the world, companies in these markets will want to be seen as leading the charge on green initiatives, as opposed to being dragged along, according to Marcheck.

The possibilities for wireless-related companies range from handset recycling programs, reducing hazardous materials within the handset and using energy-efficient equipment to evangelizing the environmental benefits of telecommuting and teleconferencing, the analyst said. Many wireless companies already are exploring the possibilities, but the effort overall still is nascent, according to Marcheck.

In the business-to-consumer environment, there's an aspect of “telling your story” of corporate responsibility in pursuing environmentally friendly practices, Marcheck said. But in the business-to-business arena there's also keen interest in learning how to leverage actual practices into a tangible, competitive edge.

“Corporations are emphasizing their actions to reduce their carbon footprint,” Marcheck said. “By and large, everyone has a ‘green story.’ A lot of it now is a marketing story, which makes sense. But it is unlikely that implementing green corporate practices will result in an ongoing competitive advantage for any company.”

As more companies take the marketing angle, companies will try to “out-green” each other, the analyst said. For instance, the term “energy efficient” gets stretched to the breaking point and there’s a danger of rendering marketing messages less effective if a claim doesn’t ring true.

Meaningful impact

In contrast, making one’s product offerings more environmentally conscious can have a more meaningful impact on a company’s competitive position, the analyst said.

Three main categories present themselves: reducing power consumption, using renewable materials in products and packaging and conformance with government regulations and/or recommendations from advocacy groups.

Equipment vendors have always touted lower energy consumption as a means to lower costs for their customers. Now it’s got a green spin. So, metrics and definitions should be clear and, in telecom as in other industries, new certifications may be necessary to bring coherence to the issue of green claims, the analyst said.

“Cisco Systems recently told me, for instance, that a teleconference with 98 participants has the same carbon footprint as one cross-country flight,” Marcheck said. “The message there is: companies are trying to quantify their actions to reduce their carbon footprint.” The sprawling subject does include numerous examples of positive, if tangentially related trends.

The global nature of the wireless industry, for instance, appears to extend the positive influence of various regulatory practices. The European Union’s RoHS (restriction of hazardous substances) directive means that global handset vendors selling into Europe meet the RoHS requirements. Beginning last year, Chinese manufacturers have had to review and disclose any hazardous substances in their products. (Chinese factories, of course, make an outsized proportion of the world’s consumer electronics, including handsets.) According to Michael Kirschner, president of Design Chain Associates L.L.C., most manufacturers are “struggling quietly” to meet an array of regulations.

Nokia Corp. may be something of an exception in that it is, in fact, a very large multinational company that has presented numerous environmentally friendly initiatives and largely been treated as a genuinely interested party — as they should, Marcheck said.

The company recently announced its “Evolve” handset, which neatly combines the green marketing angle with actual substance.

“Nokia’s mission is to develop new products that enable consumers to make sustainable choices,” said spokeswoman Laurie Armstrong.

About 65% to 80% of a Nokia phone is recyclable, she said, and the Evolve’s cover uses 50% renewable materials, as does its packaging. The handset’s charger consumes one-tenth the energy of chargers commonly in use.

“We’ve made good progress, but we want to do more,” Armstrong said.

Source: www.rcrnews.com

2.

**RoHS Substance Review:
46 Additional Substances Under scrutiny !**

**RoHS指令的物质复查:
46种附加物质进入复查范围!**

- The EU RoHS substance review is in full swing!
- The Oko Institut, who is conducting the review, has drawn up a list of 46 substances for scrutiny!



- 欧盟RoHS指令的物质复查正在全面展开!
- 负责管理复查工作的Oko 研究所拟备了一份46种需要被复查的附加物质的列表!

The EU RoHS substance review is in full swing. The Oko Institut, who is conducting the review, has drawn up a list of 46 substances for scrutiny. According to the covering letter the list "is based on declarations provided by suppliers and manufacturers of EEE, existing studies, XRF-analyses and other information."

This list and covering letter are available at <http://hse-rohs.oeko.info/index.php?id=3>

The Oko Institut are calling for industry input, however time is limited as responses need to be sent to hse-rohs@oeko.info by 28 March 2008. A quick turn around is anticipated as their letter states "For each of the potential candidate substances policy options will be recommended in the draft final report that will be published by mid of April." This gives only 2 weeks for assessing the results of the consultation.

Interestingly, the criteria of selecting these substances are evocative of REACH not RoHS. The criteria were "substances classified as CMR, PBT / vPvB or endocrine disruptors" and were drawn from Directive 67/548/EEC - which has been superseded by (incorporated into) REACH. The criteria and the term 'candidate list' are used in REACH for forming the list of Substances of Very High Concern. It is substances on this list in REACH that will be assessed for restrictions.

The IPC have called for any additional substance restrictions to come under REACH.

Similarly the joint submission from AeA and EICTA stated "During the legislative process on the REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorization of Chemicals – 2006/121/EC) Regulation a key rationale for the Regulation and inclusion of articles and notification requirements was to obviate the need for sector-specific legislation."

All of these indicators are pointing to a logical conclusion. Bringing future restrictions under REACH makes sense. All of the 6 RoHS substances are used in many other industry sectors and there is nothing particularly special about the materials used in Electrical and Electronic Equipment. Nonetheless it is prudent for any company who is affected by RoHS to educate themselves on the substance restriction requirements of REACH.

To help with this RoHS-International have recently revised their "Simplified Guidance Notes for Article Producers" to detail the restriction process under REACH, and how the restrictions may be applied. These are available from <http://www.rohs-international.com/reach/> for a small charge.

Source: www.pcb007.com

3.

WEEE evidence prices "normalised" after REPIC "chess" strategy !

- The arrangements for securing sufficient WEEE recycling evidence are now falling into place "like the pieces of a chess board"!
- People felt that the extent of producer responsibility was not clear!



REPIC的“棋子”战略表明WEEE指令的价格“正常”!

- 安排获取足够的WEEE回收，其现在的处境就像国际象棋局!
- 人们认为生产商责任的担负程度不够明确!

REPIC has said its arrangements for securing sufficient WEEE recycling evidence are now falling into place "like the pieces of a chess board", in the wake of yesterday's trading deal with Electrolink.

The producer compliance scheme is responsible for funding around half of the target level of UK WEEE recycling in the household sector by tonnage, under the WEEE Regulations.

This is because of its large producer membership including brands like Hoover, Kenwood, LG, Panasonic, Philips and Toshiba.

It has had to purchase surplus recycling evidence from rival scheme Electrolink, because it does not have sufficient collection sites on its contracted network to cover all its members' obligations under the Regulations.

Schemes have until the end of May to submit and audit their evidence of meeting WEEE Regulation recycling targets.

Evidence prices

While it will not disclose publically the details of yesterday's agreement to purchase surplus recycling evidence from rival scheme Electrolink (see letsrecycle.com story), REPIC chief executive Philip Morton today insisted that prices for surplus WEEE evidence have now "normalised".

He said prices had been allowed to escalate because some contractors had not understood which costs could be included in fees for producers. The issue has since been clarified by the government's Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR).

Dr Morton said: "People felt that the extent of producer responsibility was not clear. Discussions with BERR have seen that issued clarified, and I think the WEEE Regulations are very clear that only a proportion of the WEEE handling costs can be covered by the producer, and that other legitimate costs can be covered by organisations like the Distributor Takeback Scheme. BERR has made this very clear. Prices for 2007 have normalised, because BERR has swept away the barriers."

Speaking to letsrecycle.com this morning, Dr Morton argued that his members have always made funding available for contractors to recycle the required level of WEEE since the WEEE Directive has come into force in 27 European countries including the UK.

But, he said REPIC was not happy that other schemes were seeking to collect "vastly" more WEEE than their own members' requirements in order to pass high costs onto REPIC.

Dr Morton said he understood that collection costs vary from site to site, by type and geography, and that there has "never been an issue" with the designated collection facilities on REPIC's own collection network.

However, looking forward, the REPIC chief executive said that assuming the various issues with collection data are resolved by the Environment Agency, his scheme would be able to finalise its evidence arrangements.

He said: "Now we've seen this normalisation of prices, things are falling into place - like the pieces of a chess board."

Data

Earlier this week saw red faces at Veolia's WEEE compliance scheme, as the Environment Agency blamed it for some of the problems with WEEE collection data issued regarding July to December 2007 (see letsrecycle.com story).

Since then, the Agency has published more data on its website showing how much equipment was sent to recyclers and exporters, which reveals more questions than it answers.

The figures suggest domestic reproprocessors took in 234,000 tonnes of household WEEE in the six months up to December 2007, compared to the 158,000 tonnes that compliance schemes reported that they sent to be recycled. On the non-household side, recyclers have reported taking in 230,000 tonnes of business WEEE compared to just 10,000 tonnes reported by schemes.

While schemes may have had their members dealing with business WEEE themselves, their members are required to pass evidence on to their schemes to show the material has been recycled according to the Regulations.

The Agency has some work ahead of it to untangle these figures, to confirm that sufficient material has been recycled to meet the WEEE Regulation targets in all categories of waste electrical and electronic equipment.

Source: www.letsrecycle.com