Scoring Methodology

This page explains how every HIP Score is produced. Transparency about methodology is a core part of what makes a rating credible — and it is our strongest defence if a score is ever questioned.

HIP Ratings are commissioned and paid for by the manufacturer of the product assessed. Scores are produced solely by applying our published methodology, with human review, and the fee does not influence the result.

Current version: 1.5 · Effective July 2026

The full methodology document sets out each scoring dimension, the Regenerative Index tiers, category ceilings, and — under standards alignment — the ISO clause-mapping audit trail that underpins HIP Score version control.

What the HIP Score measures

The HIP Score (Human Impact Profile Score) is a material resilience and sustainability rating, not a carbon footprint or general environmental endorsement. It assesses seven dimensions related to materials, supply chain, and end-of-life characteristics. See the About page for a full summary.

How the score is calculated

Step 1 — Score each dimension independently

Each of the seven dimensions is assessed separately using a structured scoring rubric — a set of written criteria for each score band (0–2, 3–4, 5–6, 7–8, 9–10). The rubric for each dimension is defined in `methodology.yaml` (link below).

Step 2 — Normalise the Regenerative Index

The RI uses a scale of −10 to +10. Before weighting, it is normalised to 0–10 using:

> **RI Normalised = (RI Raw + 10) ÷ 2**

This maps −10 → 0, 0 → 5, +10 → 10.

Step 3 — Calculate the weighted HIP Score

> **HIP Score = (MSI × 0.20) + (SCR × 0.18) + (RC × 0.18) + (R × 0.13) + (SEI × 0.08) + (PL × 0.08) + (RI_norm × 0.15)**

The result is rounded to one decimal place.

Dimension weights

> **Category-specific weight profiles — As of v1.5 (July 2026), dimension weights vary by product type. The base weights below apply when no category-specific profile is matched. Seven product-type profiles are defined: buy-it-for-life durables, consumable devices, consumable units, safety-sealed products, software-dependent electronics, battery-bearing electronics, and single-use packaging. See the methodology source file for the full weight table.**

Code	Dimension	Weight	Scale
MSI	Material Scarcity Index	20%	0–10
SCR	Supply Chain Risk	18%	0–10
RC	Recyclability & Circularity	18%	0–10
R	Repairability	13%	0–10
SEI	Social & Environmental Impact	8%	0–10
PL	Product Longevity	8%	0–10
RI	Regenerative Index	15%	−10 to +10 *

** Normalised to 0–10 before weighting using the formula above.*

HIP Mark tiers

The HIP Mark is awarded when the HIP Score meets a minimum threshold:

Tier	Minimum HIP Score	RI Requirement
HIP Mark Standard	6.0	None
HIP Mark Silver	7.5	None
HIP Mark Gold	9.0	RI raw ≥ +6.0 (Regenerative)

Products scoring below 6.0 receive a HIP Score on the rating page but do not carry the HIP Mark.

Manufacturers holding a current verified rating and signed licence may display the HIP Mark. See the Brand Guidelines for visual standards, permitted usage, and licensing requirements.

Rating types: Baseline, Screened, and Verified

Category Baseline ratings are produced using publicly available data only. They rate a product category — not a specific named product — and apply conservative assumptions wherever data is missing. The result is an honest baseline for the category.

Screened Ratings are product-specific assessments using publicly available data plus a structured manufacturer submission. They do not require a full evidence dossier. A Screened Rating replaces the conservative defaults of the Category Baseline with information about the specific product, so the resulting score reflects the real product — which may be higher or lower than the category default. Commissioning a rating buys an accurate assessment, not a higher score.

Verified ratings are produced using data submitted by the manufacturer through the Resourcehip submission form. Submitted data replaces the conservative category defaults. Scores above 5 on the Social & Environmental Impact dimension require third-party audit evidence — self-reported claims alone cannot exceed 5.

Where a verified rating uses a category default for a dimension (because no specific data was submitted for that dimension), this is clearly noted as an improvement opportunity on the rating page.

The AI scoring pipeline

> **AI governance:** The HIP Score is **not** classified as high-risk AI under the EU AI Act. We voluntarily maintain a documented risk assessment, perform bias and performance testing, and offer a formal dispute and appeal process. Full details: Responsible AI & Governance.

Ratings are produced using a local AI pipeline running on Resourcehip's own hardware using Ollama. **No product data is sent to external cloud AI services.**

Component	Role
Model — qwen3.5:35b	Handles all scoring (all 7 dimensions) and all consumer prose generation
Temperature	0.1 — produces more consistent outputs
Human review	Every rating reviewed and approved before publication

No rating is ever published automatically without human sign-off.

Data sources

The following public data sources are used across ratings. Each rating page lists the specific sources used for that assessment.

Source	Used for
USGS Mineral Resources Program	Global reserve estimates and critical mineral designations
EU Critical Raw Materials List (2023)	EU high-importance, high-risk material designations
World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators	Country political stability scores for supply chain risk
iFixit Repairability Database	Standardised repairability scores for consumer products
Ellen MacArthur Foundation	Circular economy metrics and design-for-circularity benchmarks
UK WRAP	UK material recycling rates and kerbside collection data
Regenerative Organic Certified (ROC)	Verified regenerative agricultural certifications

All data sources are public domain or published under open data licences. Attribution is shown on each rating page.

Conservative by design

Where data is missing, the pipeline uses the most conservative reasonable assumption — not the most optimistic. This protects the integrity of the rating and creates a genuine incentive for manufacturers to submit better data. A verified rating with real data replaces those conservative defaults, so the resulting score reflects the actual product rather than worst-case assumptions — it may be higher or lower than the category default.

Independence and conflict of interest

Resourcehip charges manufacturers a fee to produce verified ratings. This creates an obvious question: does paying for an assessment buy a better score?

The answer is structural, not aspirational.

The fee buys an assessment, not an outcome. The assessment fee covers the cost of reviewing a manufacturer's evidence dossier against the HIP methodology. It does not purchase a minimum score, HIP Mark eligibility, or favourable treatment. The scoring pipeline applies the same rubrics, weights, and conservative defaults regardless of whether a product was submitted by a manufacturer or rated as a Category Baseline from public data.

Sub-threshold results are published. If a verified assessment produces a HIP Score below 6.0 — the minimum for a HIP Mark — or below the category baseline, that result is published on resourcehip.com.

Manufacturers cannot withdraw from publication after submitting data for assessment. Suppressing unfavourable results would destroy the mark's value for every manufacturer who earns it honestly.

Structural scoring limits apply regardless of payment. The methodology enforces caps that no commercial relationship can override:

- **Social and Environmental Impact (SEI):** Self-reported claims cannot score above 5 out of 10. Scores above 5 require submitted evidence of third-party audit or certification — ISO 14001, SA8000, B Corp, or equivalent.
- **Regenerative Index (RI):** Self-reported claims cap at +4. Scores above +5 require third-party verified evidence — ROC, FSC, PEFC, or equivalent.

These limits are enforced in the scoring pipeline. An assessor cannot override them.

Public reporting commitment. Resourcehip will publish, annually, the percentage of verified assessments that do not qualify for a HIP Mark. This figure is a basic test of methodology credibility: if every verified product qualifies, the bar is too low. We expect a meaningful proportion of products to fall below 6.0, and we will report that figure transparently.

How we review and update ratings

Ratings are reviewed by exception, not on a fixed calendar. Each week, the pipeline re-scores the full catalogue against the current methodology and public data sources. Only ratings where the score change is material — a shift of 0.5 HIP points or more, or a crossing of a HIP Mark tier boundary — enter the human review queue.

Ratings that do not change materially are automatically confirmed as current each quarter (the "last reviewed" date is refreshed). This means every published rating is either recently re-validated by a human reviewer or confirmed unchanged by the scoring pipeline within the last three months.

To guard against stale ratings that happen to remain numerically stable, Resourcehip also conducts periodic random-sample audits. Each quarter, approximately 5% of the catalogue — weighted toward commercially active categories (those with verified ratings or paid HIP Marks) — is pulled into the review queue regardless of whether the score changed. These audits are logged alongside standard reviews for full traceability.

A methodology version change (e.g., new dimension weights or rubric updates) triggers a full re-score and human review of every published rating, regardless of delta.

Methodology version history

In July 2026 we introduced category-specific weight profiles. Instead of applying the same dimension weights to every product, seven product-type profiles now tailor the weighting to what good performance actually looks like for that kind of product. A buy-it-for-life durable like cast iron cookware is weighted more heavily on repairability and longevity; a consumable-dependent device like a coffee pod machine is

weighted more on resource circularity. Of our 73 published ratings, five scores moved (cast iron cookware +0.8, electric toothbrushes +0.4, robot vacuums +0.3, cordless drills +0.2, coffee pod machines −0.1) and none changed band. The full per-category deltas are published at V1.4 delta report.

Version	Date	Key changes
1.5	July 2026	Governance-only update — no scoring, weight, rubric, or dimension changes, so no HIP score moves. Added a two-tier rating lifecycle (two-year full validity with an annual interim review), a full provenance record for every score movement to support ISO audit reconstruction, and a republish-notification policy including at least 30 days' notice before any Mark-affecting score change.
1.4	July 2026	Category-specific weight profiles (7 product types), N/A renormalisation, gating factors, composition schema, taxonomy governance policy (review-by-exception, random-sample audits, slug immutability, sub-category approval gate).
1.3	April 2026	Clarified RI scoring criteria; updated Depleting vs Extractive band definitions and added worked examples to the scoring rubric.
1.1	March 2026	Added Regenerative Index (RI) as seventh dimension. Adjusted weights: MSI 20%, SCR 18%, RC 18%, R 13%, SEI 8%, PL 8%, RI 15%.
1.0	February 2026	Initial six-dimension methodology.

Standards alignment

ISO 14024:2026 (Type I Ecolabels)

HIP is **ISO 14024-informed, not ISO-certified.** Resourcehip is building toward certification: Phase 2 (Q4 2026–2028) adds independent peer review, a Criteria Board, and third-party audit.

ISO 14024:2026 is the international standard for Type I environmental labels — independent, multi-criteria ecolabels based on lifecycle assessment. The HIP methodology was designed with these principles in mind.

What HIP aligns with:

ISO 14024 Pillar	HIP implementation
Transparency	Methodology published under CC BY-NC 4.0; all scoring rubrics and data sources are public
Multi-criteria assessment	Seven dimensions covering materials, supply chain, circularity, repairability, social impact, longevity, and regenerative potential
Science-based criteria	Rubrics cite peer-reviewed sources (OECD, ILO, RBA, USGS, BEUC) and established databases (iFixit, Ellen MacArthur Foundation, UK WRAP)

What HIP does not yet claim:

ISO 14024 Requirement	Current position
Independent governance board	HIP is currently founder-led. ISO 14024 requires a multi-stakeholder board including manufacturers, NGOs, government, and academia
Third-party audit	The HUMAN_REVIEW_CHECKLIST is an internal verification gate. ISO 14024 requires an independent external auditor
LCA-derived scores for all dimensions	RC, R, and RI are design-criteria dimensions that *inform* LCA outcomes; MSI and SCR are LCA-adjacent. Full ISO 14040/44 compliance is a Phase 2 goal

The Regenerative Index (RI) is a proprietary Resourcehip extension — there is no direct equivalent in ISO 14024 — and reflects our view that material resilience must account for regenerative potential, not only harm reduction.

Phase 2 certification roadmap:

Milestone	Target
Academic and practitioner peer review	Q4 2026
Criteria Board formation	Q1 2027
Third-party audit engagement	Q2–Q3 2027
ISO 14024 formal certification path	2027–2028

Audit-trail reference: ISO clause mapping

The standards claims above are backed by a **normative clause-mapping verification matrix** — the audit-trail provenance reference now cited from `methodology.yaml::metadata.standards_alignment.audit_trail_mapping_doc`. Each row binds a specific ISO clause to the concrete Resourcehip mechanism that implements it, with a **Built / Gap / Phase 2** status. The full matrix is maintained in `HIP_VERSIONING_ISO_DESIGN.md §5` (published under RES-1623) and is mapped against ISO 14024:2018 (Type I), with cross-checks against ISO 14025:2006 (Type III — non-conforming by design) and ISO 14021:2016 (Type II — self-declared claims).

> **Edition note. ISO 14024:2026 (published May 2026) is a technical revision that cancels and replaces ISO 14024:2018. The clause-mapping matrix below is maintained against the 2018 edition, whose clause structure the mapping was verified against. A re-mapping to the 2026 clause structure is planned and will be published when complete; in the interim the 2018 mapping remains Resourcehip's audit-trail reference. The principle-level alignment described above — transparency, multi-criteria assessment, and a life-cycle basis — is continuous across both editions.**

ISO 14024:2018 — Type I Environmental Labelling (Principles and Procedures)

Clause	Requirement (paraphrased)	Resourcehip mechanism	Status
§5.1 Voluntary nature	Programme is voluntary	HIP rating is opt-in for verified ratings; generic ratings are conservative defaults	Built
§5.4 Selection of product categories	Documented selection criteria	`category_type_mapping` + `category_weight_profiles` (v1.4)	Built
§5.5 Product environmental criteria	Criteria measurable and verifiable	Per-dimension scoring rubrics with peer-reviewed data sources	Built
§5.7 Period of validity	Declared and disclosed	Two-year validity + one-year interim review (`rating_lifecycle` , v1.5)	Built
§5.9 Public availability of methodology	Methodology publicly available	`methodology.yaml` published; CC BY-NC 4.0	Built
§6.2 Consultation	Stakeholder consultation	Phase 2 (Criteria Board, Q1 2027)	Phase 2
§6.3 Compliance and verification	Verification procedures	`HUMAN_REVIEW_CHECKLIST` , `factcheck.py` , review policy	Built
§6.5 Certification — testing	Defined test methods	Rubric anchors + `factcheck.py` audit on verified ratings	Built
§6.6 Licensing	Defined licensing procedures	HIP Mark licence model	Built
§6.7 Monitoring	Ongoing monitoring of label use	Random-sample audits (5%/quarter)	Built
§7.4 Criteria review	Periodic review of criteria	Changelog + methodology-bump-triggers-full-review	Built
§7.6 Re-evaluation of product	Defined re-evaluation triggers	`rating_lifecycle` re-rating triggers (v1.5)	Built
§8 Transparency	Information available to interested parties	All rubrics, weights, and changelog published	Built

ISO 14025:2006 — Type III Environmental Declarations (EPD)

HIP is **not** an EPD and does not claim ISO 14025 conformance. These clauses are documented as *non-conforming by design*, not as gaps to close.

Clause	Requirement	Resourcehip stance	Status
§6.1 LCA-based	Declarations based on full LCA (ISO 14040/44)	HIP is design-criteria-based; partial LCA validation documented	Non-conforming by design
§6.4 Pre-defined parameters	Product Category Rules (PCRs)	`category_weight_profiles` — analogous, not PCR-conformant	Non-conforming by design
§8 Verification	Third-party verification	Phase 2 roadmap (Q2–Q3 2027)	Phase 2

ISO 14021:2016 — Self-declared Environmental Claims (Type II)

The manufacturer-facing verified rating is a self-declared claim verified by a programme operator, which maps cleanly to Type II.

Clause	Requirement	Resourcehip mechanism	Status
§5.7 Specificity of claims	Claims specific to attributes	Seven dimensions, each scored with a public rubric	Built
§5.8 Verifiability	Claims must be verifiable	`factcheck.py` + `HUMAN_REVIEW_CHECKLIST`; public data sources	Built
§6 Symbols	Symbol-use governance	HIP Mark thresholds in `hip_score.thresholds`	Built
§7.4 Evaluation methodology	Methodology disclosed	Methodology published, all rubrics public	Built

Licence and source

The authoritative source file is `methodology.yaml` (v1.5), maintained in the Resourcehip pipeline repository.

Dispute a rating

If you believe a rating contains an error, see the Dispute a Rating page for the review process.