

Detailed Critique of Problems with R2 Standard

Basel Action Network and Electronics TakeBack Coalition

November 2008

This chart shows the primary areas where R2 language is inadequate, according to the two environmental groups who participated in the R2 dialogue. Both the Basel Action Network and the Electronics TakeBack Coalition withdrew from the process because of these issues.

For a copy of the full R2 language, go to: <http://www.decideagree.com/R2%20Document.pdf>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>Provision 1: Environmental, Health & Safety Management System General Principle – <i>An R2 electronics recycler shall develop and use an Environmental, Health, and Safety Management System (EHSMS) to plan and monitor its environmental, health, and safety practices, including the activities it undertakes to conform to these R2 Practices.</i> (a) An R2 electronics recycler shall develop, document, fully implement, review at least annually, and update as needed (e.g., as products and/or technologies change) a written EHSMS that: (1) Includes written goals and procedures and requires the organization to systematically manage its environmental, health, and safety matters, and (2) Is based on a “Plan-Do-Check-Act” model for continual improvement, and (3) Includes sections setting forth the following: ...<i>(D) An EHS hazards identification and assessment of on-site occupational and environmental risks</i> (as described in Section (c) of Provision 4),... Section (c) of Provision 4 <i>reads:</i> (c) An R2 electronics recycler shall conduct on an ongoing basis (e.g., as new types of materials are processed or new processes are utilized) a hazards identification and assessment of occupational and environmental risks that exist or could reasonably be expected to develop at the facility.</p>	<p>Leaves it up to R2 recycler to decide what’s a risk:</p> <p>Like OSHA and ISO requirements, R2 leaves it completely up to the recycler to decide whether or not to spend any time or money on determining what specific toxins are in the endlessly changing e-waste stream, and what worker exposures are occurring.</p> <p>In other words, there are no baseline performance requirements here that say “if you’re crushing CRTs, you must do annual wipe samples or air samples for lead”, or “if you’re shredding e-waste, you must, at a minimum, test semi-annually for cadmium and lead...”</p>
<p>Provision 3: Legal Requirements (Export) General Principle – <i>An R2 electronics recycler shall comply with all</i></p>	<p>Overall: The general principle suggests that R2 exports will comply with the laws of importing countries. But key details are missing in the</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p><i>applicable environmental, health, and safety legal requirements and shall only export equipment and components containing FMs to countries that legally accept them.</i></p>	<p>implementation of this principle, resulting in intentional violations of laws in importing countries. In addition, the principle itself fails to cover the transit countries, (see below), and fails to cover shredded materials containing the toxic (focus) materials (see below).</p> <p>The environmental groups wanted R2 to simply ban the export of toxic electronic waste to developing countries (consistent with all 27 European countries). When the multi-stakeholder group was unwilling to support this approach, our backup position was that the R2 document should have a fundamental principle in which R2 exports would not violate laws of the importing and transit countries. While the group agreed to that principle in concept, the final R2 language does not accomplish this in practice. Details are below.</p>
<p>3(a)(2) The plan also shall identify and document the legality – under the laws of the importing countries – of all international shipments of equipment, components, or materials containing FMs that have passed through the R2 recycler’s facility or control³.</p> <p>The recycler shall identify the countries that are receiving such shipments, obtain documentation demonstrating that each non-OECD⁴ country legally accepts such shipments, and only make such shipments to countries for which it has such documentation⁵. The documentation shall consist of one of the following:</p>	<p>R2 contains no information indicating that the 140 non-OECD Basel (developing) countries cannot legally trade in toxic wastes (going for recycling or disposal) with the US. R2 does not make it clear that it is illegal for Basel Parties (most of the rest of the world) that are not member states of the OECD group of countries, to trade in Basel wastes (including R2’s Focus Materials) with the United States because the US is a non-Party to the Convention.</p> <p>R2 does nothing to prevent violation of transit countries’ laws. “Transit countries” are not addressed in R2 export language. The 170 Basel nations (http://www.basel.int/ratif/convention.htm) are legally bound to prevent the illegal transit of Basel wastes through their ports on the way to final destination countries. Therefore, R2 will do nothing to prevent illegal trade from R2 recyclers through transit countries.</p> <p>Nothing to prevent violation of OECD treaty.</p> <p>R2 Omitted OECD countries/Footnote 4 is wrong: The US has ratified the OECD treaty (www.oecd.org) which requires the US to notify the other OECD (developed) nations before shipping certain toxic materials for recycling, such as CRT devices, batteries, etc. R2 makes no mention of this notification to the OECD countries. It also would be illegal for the US to send any OECD toxic wastes to another OECD country for disposal</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
	(only for recycling with consent). All nations should be covered by export language in R2, including OECD nations.
<p>(A) A copy of the relevant information from the United States Environmental Protection Agency, or</p> <p>(B) Documentation⁶ from the country’s Competent Authority stating that the country legally accepts such imports, or</p>	<p>No procedure for how EPA will determine what’s “relevant information.” This is inauditable: The recycler can document legality of exports with “relevant” information from the EPA. But the term “relevant information” is undefined, vague, and therefore inauditable. It does not stipulate what the EPA must do or provide in order to determine if any exports are legal in the importing and transit countries. The only correct (legal) documentation that should be required is written consent from the Competent Authority in the importing country, to import specific wastes into specific facilities that are approved to manage the hazardous materials.</p> <p>Option (B) gets the closest to correct language on legal exports, but it is missing critical requirements: While the Competent Authority in each importing and transit countries <u>are</u> the correct entities to make decisions related to their imports of toxic waste, they are required by law to provide written consent on a shipment-by-shipment basis for clearly defined wastes, through specific vendors and ports, on specific dates, to a specified facility in their countries (unless all that remains the same, in which case they can provide a ‘general consent’ for a year). In addition to adding these details, the R2 language should say “legally accepts such imports <i>from the US</i>”, which of course is illegal for the 140 non-OECD Basel countries to do.</p>
<p>(C) A copy of a law or court ruling from the importing country that demonstrates the legality of the import.</p>	<p>No copy of any law or ruling will take the place of an importing government’s specific consent to import specific wastes from the US, a non-Party to the Basel Convention: Option (C) will violate the laws of the importing country, which require the governments of the exporting nations to communicate with the Competent Authority in importing (and transit) countries. By law, the Competent Authority is the only entity in Basel countries who can determine the legality of imports of specific wastes from specific countries. And of course, it is illegal for the 140 non-OECD Basel nations to trade in hazardous wastes with the US,</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
	regardless of communications.
<p>Provision 4: On-Site Environmental Health & Safety General Principle – <i>R2 electronics recycler shall utilize practices at their facilities that protect worker health and safety and the environment.</i> (e) An R2 electronics recycler shall utilize monitoring and sampling protocols to provide assurances that the practices it employs are effectively and continuously managing the risks it has identified. This includes complying with all applicable Federal or State OSHA standards and PELs for sampling and/or monitoring.</p>	<p>See comments re: Provision 1(a) above.</p> <p>This language does not clearly require the R2 recycler to actually sample and monitor for hazardous substances identified by OSHA, and federal OSHA is not actively overseeing the electronics recycling industry.</p>
<p>Provision 5: R2 Focus Materials <i>[Note: The term “focus materials” was selected to avoid the use of “hazardous” and “waste” which have specific meanings under federal laws.]</i></p> <p>Removal of FMs (focus materials) 5(b) Prior to shredding, materials recovery, energy recovery, incineration, or land disposal of equipment or components, FMs (as well as toner and toner cartridges) shall be removed using safe and effective mechanical processing or manual dismantling, with two exceptions:</p> <p>(1) Items containing mercury if they are too small to remove safely at reasonable cost, and workers are protected from the risks posed by the mercury during and subsequent to any processing or manual dismantling of the equipment containing it, and the equipment and components containing such items are sent to materials recovery facilities that are properly licensed to receive, and that utilize technology designed to safely and effectively manage, equipment or components containing such mercury-containing items.</p>	<p>R2 allows shredding of mercury-containing devices: This R2 language allows a certified R2 recycler to shred mercury-containing devices if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s too costly to remove them, and • Workers are “protected from risk,” and • Shredded mercury is sent to properly licensed and equipped facilities. <p>These are large loopholes that give recyclers too much latitude to decide not to remove mercury before shredding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is labor intensive (costly) for anyone to hand remove small mercury lamps and switches from problematic LCDs, circuit boards, etc. but nevertheless, it is the best management practice. (This is a well-known issue/problem for LCD recycling); and • There is currently no negative-pressure shredding equipment that adequately captures all mercury, thereby protecting the workers If the R2 language was intended to allow for future technology that DOES capture all shredded mercury, then the language must be rewritten. Meanwhile, current language in this provision combined with no requirement for R2 recyclers to test for mercury and no active federal OSHA oversight of the industry could easily result in mercury exposures in-house and

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>(2) CRTs, batteries, and circuit boards contained in equipment or components destined for materials recovery need not be removed prior to shredding and/or materials recovery if the shredding and/or materials recovery occurs in facilities that are properly licensed to receive, and that utilize technology designed to safely and effectively manage, equipment or components containing these FMs.</p> <p>5(d) Energy Recovery, Incineration, and Land Disposal of FMs (d) An R2 electronics recycler shall not utilize energy recovery, incineration, or land disposal as a management strategy for FMs or equipment and components containing FMs⁸. However, if circumstances beyond the control of the R2 recycler disrupt its normal management of an FM, it may consider these technologies to the extent allowed under applicable law.</p> <p>Selection and Ongoing Due Diligence of Downstream Vendors for FMs 5 (e) For shipments of removed FMs, and shipments of equipment and components containing FMs, an R2 electronics recycler shall select downstream vendors that possess and conform to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The R2 recycler’s FM Management Plan (developed in accordance with and including the requirements set forth in Sections (b) - (d) above), (2) A documented environmental, health, and safety management system, (3) A list of its environmental permits and copies of each, (4) This Section (e) of Provision 5, thereby establishing that each vendor in the Recycling Chain conforms to these subsections (1) – (7), 	<p>downstream; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most smelters do not want mercury. Furthermore, some smelters are equipped with mercury-processing technology (and permitted to use it), but don’t utilize that technology for the electronics processing side of their business. <p>R2 fails to require removal of batteries prior to shredding: Currently, US recyclers are licensed to operate shredders with no regulations in many states to remove batteries, which contain both toxic and flammable substances such as perchlorate, potassium hydroxide, cadmium, lithium, lead, phosphate, mercury, etc.</p> <p>R2 allows toxic substances into non-hazardous waste disposal facilities: This standard discourages but will continue to allow the disposal of hazardous electronic waste in municipal landfills and incinerators, in undefined circumstances (e.g. in the event of commodity prices falling, which are easily “beyond the control of the R2 recycler”). This is completely inappropriate as much e-waste fails the TCLP leach tests for lead and other hazardous metals, and our landfills and incinerators designed for solid waste are not adequate for managing hazardous waste. Furthermore, the incineration of this material can release mercury and lead into the environment.</p> <p>Failure to cover shredded toxic materials in downstream due diligence requirements: 5 (e) outlines how and when R2 recyclers must perform due diligence on vendors to whom they send “shipments of removed FMs, and shipments of equipment and components containing FMs”, but apparently completely fails to include any shredded/granulated/processed materials that are derived from the toxic “focus materials” (except for a subset of separated shredded circuit boards). For example, it appears that if an R2 recycler shreds CPUs or printers and faxes (which contain circuit boards), then these shipments of shredded materials containing FMs are completely exempt from all requirements for downstream due diligence, including export restrictions.</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>(5) Provision 6 (Reuse), (6) The exporting requirements of Provision 3 (a) (2), and (7) Provision 7 (Tracking Throughput).</p> <p>(f) An R2 electronics recycler shall confirm, through audits or other similarly effective means that each downstream vendor in the Recycling Chain to which Section (e) applies continues to conform to the requirements of Section (e) for as long as it receives FMs directly or indirectly from the R2 recycler.</p>	<p>Ideally, customers will want to be able to hold the R2 certified recycler accountable for the chain of custody of toxic materials throughout final disposition. But this does not occur with language in 5(e)(4), which asks only the next tier vendor to please do the same for their downstream vendor, who theoretically that vendor does the same for the next downstream vendor, etc. See comments on 5(f) for problems with R2 verification of this loose chain of custody.</p> <p>Inauditable and unaccountable language used. Any R2 requirements, especially export requirements, are meaningless if there is not strong language holding the downstream vendors to the same standards as the R2 recyclers. We believe that the R2 recycler should audit all downstream vendors to assure compliance. But R2 doesn't require audits, but instead allows "other similarly effective means" without defining what that means. Because assuring downstream compliance is costly, many recyclers will cut corners here. Customers should be highly concerned with this poor level of accountability for the R2 recyclers' downstream.</p> <p>Many R2 shipments for 'reuse' are exempt from any downstream due diligence requirements, including the export requirements. While Provision 5(e) and (f) appear to require downstream due diligence, language in Provision 6 exempts a number of vendors from any Provision 5 due diligence. That language is found in 6 (e), which says, "An R2 electronics recycler need not conform to the downstream requirements of Provision 5 for shipments that satisfy the requirements of Section (c) or (d) [in Provision 6 – listed in left column under Prov 6 below], or are new and in their original packaging." More exemptions from downstream due diligence are found in Provision 6 (f): "An R2 electronics recycler need not conform to the exporting requirements of Provision 3 (a) (2) for shipments that satisfy either the functionality requirement of Section (c) (1) or the requirements of Section (d), or are new and in their original packaging." In other words, there appears to be very significant due diligence</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
	<p>loopholes in the language in Provision 6 (Reuse), which completely exempt some R2 refurbishers/recyclers from doing any due diligence, and from the export restrictions, when exporting the following types of shipments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipments to ‘recipient vendors’: Once the R2 refurbisher has ‘confirmed’ that the ‘recipient vendor’ (in any country) is meeting 3 requirements (receiving what he expects, selling only functioning equipment, and managing scrap according to R2), then the R2 refurbisher appears to be completely exempt from doing any due diligence on this vendor, or their downstream, including the now missing requirements to have an EMS, establish a chain of custody - particularly for the toxic scrap, comply with the export restrictions, or track throughput . And how will R2 auditors assure conformity with R2 for these shipments of non-working equipment to ‘recipient vendors’ in other countries, especially when little due diligence must be performed? • Exports to ‘recipient vendors’ in violation of laws in importing countries [See comments for 6(c)(e) below for information on this problem.] • Repeated shipments of less than 15 untested or non-working units for “sampling” are exempt from all due diligence requirements and export restrictions [citations: 6(d) and (f)] as long as they are not “shipments within a proximate timeframe”. One can easily interpret this to mean every other R2 shipment of less than 15 non-working units can be freely exported to a vendor in another country for the purpose of ‘sampling’, with no controls in place. What happens if the recipient likes the ‘samples’? Why would R2 allow these non-working samples if a full load of similar non-working units to the same recipient is not allowed to be exported freely? • Shipments less than 15 untested or non-working units to buyers if there is a “practical return policy” (undefined) [citation: 6(d)] If a foreign buyer collects many small shipments of non-

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems
	<p>working equipment from R2 certified refurbishers and exports them, why would anyone expect those units to be returned to the US, regardless of how “practical” a return policy might be?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipments of new equipment (which can be non-working) if still in its package is free of all due diligence and export requirements. [citations: 6(e) and (f)] Off-spec, not-working-but-on-warranty, or otherwise faulty new equipment “in their original packaging” is frequently sent to recyclers because the products have bad circuit boards, bad batteries, or do not work. To completely exempt this equally toxic waste stream from all due diligence and export requirements does not constitute “responsible recycling”.
<p>Definition of Focus Materials <i>[We discuss this here instead of in definitions section, since Section 5 deals with Focus Materials.]</i> “R2 Focus Materials”, also referred to as “FMs”, are materials in end-of-life electronic equipment that warrant greater care during recycling, refurbishing, materials recovery, energy recovery, incineration, and/or disposal due to their toxicity or other potential adverse worker health and safety, public health, or environmental effects that can arise if the materials are managed without appropriate safeguards.</p> <p>The following are R2 Focus Materials: (1) Items containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), (2) Items containing mercury, (3) CRTs and CRT glass, (4) Batteries (5) Whole and shredded circuit boards, except for whole and shredded circuit boards that do not contain lead solder, and have undergone safe and effective mechanical processing, or manual dismantling, to remove mercury and batteries.</p> <p>Equipment, components, or materials (whole or shredded) that have</p>	<p>List of focus materials is missing some key hazardous materials, resulting in violations of laws in importing countries: The list of focus materials fails to include known serious electronic waste hazards such as cadmium, beryllium, chromium, arsenic, selenium and hazardous toners. By not listing these as controllable, these can be freely exported, usually in violation of laws in importing countries, and therefore of Provision 3 in this standard.</p> <p>All circuit boards (in any form) should be included in this definition, unless it is proven that the entire batch is free of all the toxins listed in paragraph above, plus lead.</p> <p>This definition should also include all untested or non-working equipment or parts containing any of the items in (1) - (5).</p> <p>This definition should also clearly include all materials (shredded, granulated, etc.) that are derived from equipment or parts containing items (1) - (5).</p> <p>The Basel Convention covers even “de minimus” quantities (not defined in R2) of toxic wastes, and therefore, in order for the R2 recycler to comply with the exporting requirements in Provision 3 of this standard,</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>undergone safe and effective mechanical processing or manual dismantling to remove FMs, yet still retain de minimus amounts of FMs, are not subject to the R2 requirements that are triggered by the presence of FMs.</p>	<p>de minimus amounts of toxins should be included.</p>
<p>Provision 6: Reusable Equipment & Components</p> <p>6 (c) An R2 electronics recycler, prior to shipping equipment and components (except equipment and components that are new and in their original packaging) that contain FMs and that will be reused as is or repaired, refurbished, or remanufactured, shall:</p> <p>(1) Utilize effective testing methods to confirm that the Key Functions of the equipment or components are working properly, or...</p> <p>(2) Determine that the recipient vendor is a certified R2 electronics recycler, or</p> <p>6 (c)(3) Confirm through an appropriate combination of contractual agreements, detailed materials tracking and recordkeeping, and auditing that:</p> <p>(A) The equipment or components meet the specifications of the recipient vendor, and</p> <p>(B) The recipient vendor sells the equipment or components for reuse, with their Key Functions functioning properly, and</p> <p>(C) The recipient vendor manages all residual FMs resulting from refurbishing operations in a manner that conforms to the R2 Practices.</p>	<p>“New” equipment contains toxins: Brand new equipment going for refurbishment, such as off-spec equipment, can contain bad circuit boards, batteries, mercury lamps. R2 fails to capture this toxic waste.</p> <p>No definition of “effective testing methods”: Inauditable and bound to create a huge loophole, e.g. a ‘power-up’ test on a monitor simply tests the power supply, and will not rule out screen burned, scratched, and serious display failures.</p> <p>R2 refurbisher could ship to developing countries if R2 goes global: If this standard goes into use globally and refurbishers in China, India, South America, etc. become certified, they would provide a complete exemption from all export and other downstream requirements.</p> <p>Huge loophole for R2 recycler: This section 6(c)(3) allows the R2 recycler to send any kinds of equipment and parts to any tier vendor (“recipient vendor” is not defined), and does not define the minimum “appropriate combination” of due diligence mechanisms required to oversee these vendors. In other words, R2 appears to allow sub-sub-sub vendors to finally be held responsible (by the R2 recycler’s sub-sub vendor?) for only selling working equipment.</p> <p>Can the ‘recipient vendor’ be located in China or other developing country? It is unclear whether the Provision 3 export restrictions or the Provision 6(e) due diligence exemptions prevail over ‘recipient vendors’ in 6(c)(3). In other words, when “An R2 electronics recycler need not conform to the downstream requirements of Provision 5 [including the</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>(d) An R2 electronics recycler need not conform to Section (c) for shipments of less than 15 units that either are going to a new vendor as a sample for purposes of evaluation of whether to purchase larger quantities for refurbishment or that are being sold with a practical return policy to an end user. This Section (d) does not apply to multiple sales or shipments within a proximate timeframe to the same entity.</p> <p>(e) An R2 electronics recycler need not conform to the downstream requirements of Provision 5 for shipments that satisfy the requirements of Section (c) or (d), or are new and in their original packaging.</p> <p>6 (f) An R2 electronics recycler need not conform to the exporting</p>	<p>export requirements in Provision 3] <i>for shipments that satisfy the requirements of Section (c)...</i>”, this can easily be interpreted as meaning that the R2 recycler/refurbisher can ship untested or non-working equipment to a vendor in a developing country, as long as that vendor meets the 3 requirements laid out in 6(c)(3). R2 should clearly state that the transfer (export) of non-working or untested equipment going for repair or refurbishment must comply with the export provision.</p> <p>No testing required/ Inauditable: 6(c)(3)(B) does not require the recipient vendors to test the equipment and parts, like the R2 refurbisher must. While it may appear implicit in this language, testing and labeling equipment should be explicitly required for anyone exempt from all due diligence requirements, including export requirements. Also, it is virtually impossible for an R2 recycler to control what the sub-sub “recipient vendor” does with scrap generated from the refurbishing process, particularly if it is located in another country, or the recipient vendor can make more money selling scrap to brokers than managing it according to R2 standards. Furthermore, the R2 auditors will not be able to assure conformity to the R2 standards of sub-sub vendors. This is inauditable.</p> <p>Clear violation of importing countries laws for small quantities. The Basel Convention does not exempt small quantities. Export of certain equipment for re-use is exempt from all exporting requirements of R2 if it involves export of 15 units or less. This is completely incompatible with international law, and therefore the laws of many importing countries, who have legally –binding obligations under international treaties they have ratified. The Basel Parties must be notified of any size shipment, regardless of “return policies”.</p> <p>Clear violation of importing countries’ laws for non-working “new equipment”: New equipment still in the package is frequently turned over to recyclers/refurbishers because of production errors (non-functionality), quality problems, or other off-spec reasons that could</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>requirements of Provision 3 (a) (2) for shipments that satisfy either the functionality requirement of Section (c) (1) or the requirements of Section (d), or are new and in their original packaging.</p>	<p>result in toxic waste from these “new” products. If a toxic material is destined for recycling or disposal, it is regulated under Basel, but here R2 provides an unqualified exemption.</p>
<p>Provision 7: Tracking Throughput <i>General Principle – An R2 electronics recycler shall maintain business records sufficient to demonstrate the material flow of equipment, components, and materials that pass through its facility.</i></p> <p>(a) An R2 electronics recycler shall maintain for at least three years commercial contracts, bills of lading, or other commercially-accepted documentation for all transfers of equipment, components, and materials into and out of its facility, as well as for any brokering transactions.</p>	<p>Fails to require tracking of toxic materials (FMs and toner) throughout final disposition.</p>
<p>Missing Provision: Ban on Prison Recycling</p>	<p>R2 continues to allow the use of prison labor to manage electronic waste, which has in the past resulted in serious contamination of inmates. Laborers lack the same rights and protections afforded private sector hazardous waste workers. Prison recycling operations are government subsidized, which distorts the free market for establishing adequate recycling infrastructure in the US by unfairly competing with the private sector.</p>
<p>DEFINITIONS</p> <p>“Focus Materials” See discussion of Focus Materials definition above, with Provision 5.</p> <p>“Key Functions” “Key Functions” are the originally-intended functions of a unit of equipment or component, or a subset thereof, that will satisfactorily serve the purpose(s) of someone who will reuse the unit.</p> <p>“Recycling Chain” “Recycling Chain” refers to all the downstream vendors that handle end-</p>	<p>A definition of ‘key functions’ based on what various end users may or many not want (many of them in other countries) does not provide a clear and auditable determination of functionality. Instead, R2 recyclers should be held to a specific standard for testing and labeling equipment and parts, as in Europe and the UN’s Mobile Phone Partnership Initiative.</p> <p>This term is used with “working properly” which is never defined in R2, and R2 fails to define baseline testing requirements to determine if a device or part is “working properly” (as described 6(c)(1).</p> <p>This definition fails to explicitly require that the Recycling Chain must</p>

R2 Language (Selected excerpts with concerns highlighted)	Problems with R2 language (NGO critique)
<p>of-life equipment, components, or materials that pass through an R2 electronics recycler’s facility or control. It includes, but does not extend beyond materials recovery facilities such as smelters. For equipment and components that are sold or donated for reuse, it does not extend beyond the entity that conforms with Provision 6 (c) or (d).</p> <p>“Recyclers” “Recyclers” includes but need not be limited to electronics resellers, refurbishers, recyclers, demanufacturers, asset recoverers, brokers, as well as leasing companies that engage in these activities.</p>	<p>include all processors until there is no further processing/separation of mixed materials but only materials ready for direct use in manufacturing, etc.</p> <p>Will R2 Certify Brokers? Because a broker can be an R2 “recycler”, by definition in R2, is it possible brokers will become fully certified? It appears that they can, by simply claiming that most of the standard does not apply to them, but meet the minimal requirements that do, such as: written policies for an EHSMS, a management hierarchy, and compliance with legal requirements. The broker would primarily have to comply with the reuse requirements pertaining to “recipient vendors”. They’d need to keep records of transactions. No need for any on-site compliance, implementing an EHSMS, or facility security, insurance or storage requirements. And export? This is all unclear.</p>