

SRE-09-001(E)
January 16th, 2009

Dear Suppliers

Request for Preventing Environmental Non-Compliance against SS-00259
(5th Report)

Thank you very much for your continuous cooperation and support to Sony's Green Partner Activities.

Recently, we found some non-compliant cases caused by misunderstanding, purchasing Designated Raw Materials from Non-Green Partner Suppliers, and environmental accidents of lead-containing solder.

We would like to share the cases illustrated below with you and ask you to utilize such cases to improve your preventing measures of environmental non-compliance accident.

We also expect that you share those cases with your suppliers and help them improve on their environmental management system for preventing non-compliance accident.

Thank you again for your prompt attention on this matter.

Best Regards,



Masashi Itoh

General Manager

Supplier Relations Department

Procurement Center

Sony Corporation

Inquires about this matter, please contact:

Supplier Relations Department, Procurement Center, Sony Corporation

E-Mail : Prc.Env@jp.sony.com

<Non-compliant case of Designated Raw Material>

[Case 1] A supplier purchased “magnet wire” from a Non-Green Partner Certified Supplier based on their misunderstanding that magnet wire was a coating wire and coating wire was not in the scope of Designated Raw Materials. They did not confirm the definition of Designated Raw Materials in the letter issued on July 27th, 2007.

Magnet wire and enamel wire are all defined as coated wire in the scope of Designated Raw Materials. The coated wire defined by Sony is a little different from the one in the industry for the purpose of environmental chemical substances management. Therefore we would like you to reconfirm the definition of Designated Raw Materials and share the correct understanding among your in-house members and suppliers.

<Related Document>

- [Selection of Raw Materials for New Parts]issued on July 14th, 2003
- [Sony Group Procedures for Environmental Quality Control (Supplier's Copy) 2nd version]issued on May 15th, 2006, PQ-2029E-02
- [Definition of Designated Raw Materials]issue on July 27th, 2007, SRE-06-010

[Case 2] A part was originally approved by Sony parts approval inspection prior to July, 2003. After that, the specification of the part was changed. However, Designated Raw Materials used on this part was not subject to the specification change. The supplier considered they were allowed to use the same designated raw materials despite such materials were from Non-Green Partner Certified Suppliers.

When specification is changed after July, 2003, no matter that Designated Raw Materials used on this part was changed or not, the Designated Raw Materials should be purchased from Green Partner Certified Suppliers. So please make sure the Designated Raw Materials used on the part are from Green Partner Certified Suppliers, when the specification of the part is changed regardless such change affects the materials used or not.

<Related Document>

- [Selection of Raw Materials for New Parts (Revised)]issued on July 14th, 2003

[Case 3] A supplier outsourced ink printing process to a third party. When the outsourced compounded ink, the operator in charge of Sony's product was absent and other operator took his place. Because there was no written instruction he/she compounded the lead-containing ink for Sony's product as he/she does for other customers.

In manufacturing process, regardless of in-house or an outsourced, the supplier should give the clear written instruction on the ink to be used so that the operator does not use the not-confirmed materials but the designated one.

Especially when a supplier outsources a part of their manufacturing process to a third party, they are required to check, prior to the mass production, whether the third party uses lead containing materials or not and in case it uses such materials the supplier is required to instruct the third party to manage the lead-containing materials insulated in distinguishing from Sony's to prevent mixing in or contamination.

< Non-compliant case of lead-containing solder >

[Case 1] In DIP manufacturing, there are two containers. One is used for lead-free solder, the other for Lead-containing solder. The distinguishing management between these two kinds of solders was insufficient at a supplier, so a miss operation was happened that an operator put lead-containing solder into the lead-free container. Finally, the solder contaminated with lead was used to Sony's Hybrid IC.

In case a supplier uses both of lead-free and lead-containing solders, the supplier is required to establish the production process or procedure to prevent mixing into each other. Furthermore, at solder storage, two different types of solders should be stored in the manner operators do not mix them up, such as keeping one away from the other, or labeling with different color. In addition the instruction to operators to put solder into xx with the mark on top.

[Case 2] A supplier has instructed the outsourced manufacturer to use lead-free solder to Sony's product on a verbal basis, but not indicated "Use lead-free" on the drawing. Afterward, the operator in charge at that manufacturer was changed by a new staff. The new operator didn't see any instruction of lead-free from the drawing and used lead-containing solder to the product.

Such instructions as "use lead-free solder" should be given in the form of document including drawings. Verbal instruction cannot cope with operator changes and may cause the environmental accident.

[Case 3] A supplier classified solder used in production was a kind of sub-material in their operation. As a result sub-materials were out of scope of their environmental control system, and they purchased and used the lead-containing solder.

The materials used, attached or remained on product are all in the scope of SS-00259, regardless of materials or sub-materials. If a sub-material used on product, it should be managed either same with materials achieving environmental compliance.