

Summary:

| | Score | Highest Possible Score |
|---------------|----------|------------------------|
| Review | 0 | 22 |
| Reduce | 2 | 56 |
| Policy Stance | 0 | 10 |
| Report | 0 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 2 | 100 |

Full Scorecard:

| | Questions/Criteria | Scoring Guideposts (possible points) | Score | Highest Possible Score | |
|----------------------|---|---|----------|------------------------|---|
| Review | | | 0 | 22 | |
| 1 | GHG emissions inventory completed? | No (0); Yes, partial inventory only reviewing some of the company's emission sources (1-3, dependent on percentage of emitting sectors covered); Yes, almost comprehensive inventory (4); Yes, comprehensive inventory (5) | 0 | 5 | Identify and quantify emissions (22) |
| 2 | Rough calculations or standard protocol/calculator? | Rough, partial calculations (1); Generalized, but complete calculations (estimates, perhaps using a general calculator) (2); Full calculations using a standard protocol/methodology (e.g., WRI) (3) | 0 | 3 | |
| 3 | Are Kyoto gases besides CO2 included? | Just inventorying CO2 emissions (0); Measuring CO2, CH4, and N2O (1); All relevant, material Kyoto gases included (2) If other Kyoto gases are not emitted, full points can be awarded | 0 | 2 | |
| 4 | Are indirect emissions accounted for? (e.g., supply chain, travel, commuting, use/disposal of products/services, investment) | Only accounting for direct and facility energy use emissions (0); Including emissions from one indirect source (1); Including emissions from multiple indirect sources (2-4) | 0 | 4 | |
| 5 | Is there external, qualified third party verification of emissions data, reductions, and reporting (where applicable)? | No (0); Yes, verification by a trade association (1); Yes, verification by a qualified, external consultant working on company's inventory (2); Yes, verification by a qualified, third-party, not involved in developing the inventory (3) Extra point for verification beyond basic inventory (e.g., verification of physical reductions or reporting) | 0 | 4 | |
| 6 | Is the inventory an ongoing, regular process accounting for multiple years? | No time project (0); Plans for future, annual inventory work (1); At least two inventories completed (2); Multiple inventories completed (3); Multiple inventories completed and a time-series of emissions presented (i.e., emissions covering beyond the baseline and current year) (4) | 0 | 4 | |
| Reduce | | | 2 | 56 | |
| 7 | Has a clear goal been set? | No target (0); Loose, undefined goal (1); Defined goal specifying baseline, reduction amount/percentage, or timeframe but not all three (2-3); Goal with defined baseline, reduction amount/percentage, and timeframe (4) | 0 | 4 | Set goals and establish internal management (19) |
| 8 | Strength of baseline year used for the reduction goal (keeping in mind changes in company's size/composition) | No baseline (0); Using year of inventory or 1-4 years back as baseline (1); Using a baseline 5-10 years back (2); Baseline over 10 years back (3); When scoring, consider if company has significantly changed in size or divested during the time period or if the company has picked a year with atypically high emissions, as this will affect the appropriateness of the baseline; also adjust scoring if company is new and older baselines are not possible | 0 | 3 | |
| 9 | Magnitude of reduction goal (considering size of reduction and target year) | No reduction goal (0); Keep emissions constant (1); Up to 5% reduction (2); 6-10% reduction (3); >10% reduction (4); Discretionary point based on timeliness of target year (i.e., large goal set for near term scores better than small reduction goal set far in the future) | 0 | 5 | |
| 10 | Have a management plan and organizational structure been established for climate? | No plan established (0); General carbon/climate plan established (1); Designation of committee or responsible parties for company climate strategy (2); Designation of key responsible people and a specific plan for climate action (3); Climate strategy incorporated into overall business strategy (4); Extra point for publicly available detailed plan | 0 | 5 | |
| 11 | Is there top-level support for climate change action? | No (0); Senior level executive or Board members designated as responsible for climate issues (1); Clear, public articulation of company's views on climate by CEO and/or top management (2) | 1 | 2 | Achieve reductions (take steps, achieve, verify) (27) |
| 12 | Has the company taken steps towards achieving reduction target? (Interim progress on reduction) | No (0); Points awarded for actions such as the following: Programs to improve energy efficiency; Use of emissions-reducing technology; Projects to reduce corporate travel; Investments in technology for future reductions; Incentive programs; Purchase of additional, verifiable offsets; etc.; Up to 2 points per action, based on level and depth of actions and company size, for a maximum of 8 points | 0 | 8 | |
| 13 | Has the company achieved emissions reductions? | No (0); Partial reduction (below target or in limited sub-sectors) (1-4); Achieved goal reductions or reductions on a timeline to meet significant target in a later year (5-6); Exceeded goal reductions (7-10) Points awarded here for absolute or intensity-based achievements | 0 | 10 | |
| 14 | Absolute or intensity-based reductions? | Only intensity-based (relative) reductions (0); Absolute reductions for a sub-unit of the company (1-2); All absolute reductions (3-4) When scoring, consider if company has significantly changed in size or divested during the time period, as this will affect ease of achieving absolute reductions; Note that absolute reductions can be achieved even if a relative target was set | 0 | 4 | |
| 15 | Has the company achieved verified reductions to date (prior to current goal-setting)? | No (0); Yes, reductions achieved prior to current goal setting (1-5) (based on magnitude, frequency, etc.) | 0 | 5 | |
| 16 | Has the company made successful efforts to reduce GHG impacts associated with the use of its products/services? | No (0); Conducting partial analyses (e.g., partial LCA, eco-assessment, etc.) of GHG impacts from use of products/services (1); Conducting full analyses of GHG impacts associated with use of products/services (2); Producing low/no carbon product line that realizes a reduction in carbon-intensity of the traditional line of products/services (3-4) | 1 | 4 | Encourage reductions by others (10) |
| 17 | Does the company work to educate its employees, trade association, and/or customers on how they can reduce individual GHG emissions (through direct education programs, incentives, or philanthropic projects)? | No educational efforts (0); Up to 2 points for each of the following categories: Internal employee education, Incentives that will increase employee awareness (e.g., tax breaks for using mass transit), Education of peer companies within trade association, and customer/general public education, for a maximum of 4 points | 0 | 4 | |
| 18 | Does the company require suppliers to take climate change action or give preference to those that do? | No (0); Yes, gives preference to suppliers who take action (1); Yes, requires suppliers to take action (2) | 0 | 2 | |
| Policy Stance | | | 0 | 10 | |
| 19 | Does the company support public policy that could require mandatory climate change action by business? | No (0); Yes, on a local level or in a generalized manner (1-3); Yes, on a state or regional scale or in multiple strong general stances (4-6); Yes, supports non-voluntary federal- or international-level initiatives (7-10); Points awarded within each specified range for demonstrated depth of support in company materials (website, publications), via a public forum (press, speeches, advertising), and active lobbying | 0 | 10 | Support public policy to require reductions (-10, +10) |
| 20 | Does the company oppose public policy on climate change that could require mandatory action by business, or has it made efforts to undermine climate change action? | No (0); Yes, opposes local initiative (1-3); Yes, opposes a state or regional scale initiative (4-6); Yes, publicly opposes non-voluntary federal-level initiatives (7-10); Range of negative points awarded for depth of opposition as displayed in company materials (website, publications), via a public forum (press, speeches, advertising), and active lobbying; Note: negative points will also be awarded if company belongs to trade association seeking to undermine climate change action | 0 | (up to -10) | |
| Report | | | 0 | 12 | |
| 21 | Is the company publicly reporting on emissions, risks, and actions? How is information disclosed? Company-based (e.g., on their website or annual report) or through a credible third-party program (e.g., CDP, GRI, etc.)? | No information on company climate change actions is available (0); Minimal, general info available through company report or website (1-2); Minimal/basic info available through third party (e.g., CDP) (3-4); Detailed info (emissions, reductions, goals) on company website/reports (5-6); Detailed disclosure through third-party (7-8); an extra 1-2 points awarded for time series of emissions and other climate action or risk data (e.g., in SEC filings or 10Ks) | 0 | 10 | Publicly disclose emissions (inventory), reductions, and related actions (12) |
| 22 | Are emissions broken out by facility, business unit, country of operations, or other meaningful subsegments? | Only total emissions or one lumped number are presented (0); Some sub-unit emissions broken out (1); Emissions clearly tallied by company-appropriate sub-units (2) | 0 | 2 | |
| Total | | | 2 | 100 | |

Sources Carbon Disclosure Project response (CDP4)
 Apple and the Environment website
 "A Greener Apple" - Statement from Steve Jobs, CEO
 Apple Supplier Code of Conduct