

Smoothie operators?



Smoothie companies are profiting from a health boom, but are their ethics as pure as the fruit they include? Dr Nicola Scott investigates...

Smoothies are certainly very popular. Last year, Britons drank 34 million litres of them, enough to fill 14 Olympic sized swimming pools.¹ In 2006 £170 million worth of smoothies were sold in the UK,² and last December the BBC reported an approaching "smoothie war" between smoothie bar chains jostling for consumer loyalty in an increasingly health-conscious society.³ Given the health benefits often claimed by companies, are these images justified and do their ethical credentials match the health claims? Or is there some pulp fiction going on?

5 a day?

The UK's National Health Service's recent drive for us to eat at least five portions of fruit and vegetables daily came at a time when British teenagers were found not to be eating them. The UK was 19th out of 21 of the world's economically richest countries in terms of the percentage of 11, 13 and 15 year olds who reported eating fruit every day.⁴ Smoothies have often been marketed as products which could contribute to buck this trend, helping us to achieve the government's 5-a-day target. However, Department of Health guidelines state that a drink can only ever count as one portion despite the amount you drink or however many fruits are blended - a message backed by the Food Standards

Fruit Hit Smoothies (01179 175 620) and **Soma Organic Smoothies** (0870 9507662) come out best on the table. Fruit Hit smoothies are Fairtrade while Soma's are organic.

Agency. Some companies in our table have been criticised for suggesting that their products included more than one portion of fruit. However Dr Cathy Higginson of Health Scotland added that some smoothies appear to have higher levels of fibre and the guidelines might need clarification.⁵

In an attempt to make fruit smoothies more appealing to children, in May 2007 Innocent announced that its Kids Smoothies would be sold in McDonald's Happy Meals in a few UK branches in the North East.⁶ Given criticisms made of fast food chains such as those in the films 'Supersize Me' and 'Fast Food Nation', Innocent's customers had mixed views about this decision:

"I don't see it as supporting McDonalds' ethics, I see it as helping the children who eat there to be a bit healthier."

"What were you thinking of - McJuice, McSmoothie or McDollar?"

Surely others must ensure that children eat fruit long before they become a consumer in a fast food restaurant, such as their parents, guardians, schools, or even the government. For example, healthy smoothies could be made more affordable in schools, or other places where children spend time.⁸

Healthy for the environment?

While drinking pure fruit smoothies is a healthier option compared to other snacks-on-the-go such as chocolate bars, the environmental impact of their production must be considered. Transporting fruit year-round from tropical climates, as well as packaging it in plastic bottles often made from non-renewable fossil fuels, can all negatively affect the environment. Annually in the UK we generate an estimated 1.5 million tonnes of plastic waste through discarded packaging.⁹ To reflect consumer interest in these issues, in March 2007 the Carbon Trust launched a Carbon Reduction Label for products.¹⁰ The Trust, a UK government-funded independent company established to help the business and public sector reduce carbon emissions (a key cause of climate change), had developed a label to demonstrate a commitment from companies to reduce their carbon footprint through cutting their carbon emissions, including carbon dioxide (CO2). In order for a company to use the label, it had to

agree to reduce its carbon footprint over two years from the date that products received the Label. Innocent's Mangoes & Passion Fruits smoothie was the company's first product to include this label.⁷ Also, by June 2007 the company predicted that its bottles will be made from post consumer recycled PET (Polyethylene terephthalate),¹¹ a plastic regarded by some environmentalists as less harmful to the environment than, for example, PVC.

Fairtrade

At the time of writing only one company in the product table, The Natural Beverage Company, had its complete range of smoothies Fairtrade certified, while Soma Organic was in the process of gaining Fairtrade accreditation. Consequently, when looking at the table it seems that incorporating ethical supply chain values has not been important to many companies, especially as many fruits used in smoothies can now be sourced from certified Fairtrade suppliers, or other accreditation schemes which address supply chain issues.

References - 1 Mintel Report, October 2006, 'Smoothies' 2 Key Note Market Report, March 2007, 'Fruit Juices & Health Drinks' 3 www.bbc.co.uk viewed 09/05/07 4 UNICEF, October 2006, 'Child Poverty in Perspective: An Overview of Child Well-Being in Rich Countries' 5 The Scotsman, 9/2/06 6 www.innocentdrinks.co.uk viewed 1/5/07 See EC105 for information about the Rainforest Alliance 7 www.innocentdrinks.co.uk viewed 2/5/07 8 Innocent Kids' range sold in schools were cheaper at the time of writing than its bottled smoothies sold in high street shops 9 Figure adapted from www.wasteonline.org.uk viewed 15/5/07 10 www.carbon-label.co.uk viewed 2/5/07 11 Fresh Trading Ltd's Sustainability Policy April 2007 12 www.ellaskitchen.co.uk viewed 26/4/07



SMOOTH MARKETING:

Links

- BBC Food in Season** www.bbc.co.uk/food/in_season - Find out which UK fruits are in season to help you to make a smoothie using locally-sourced ingredients.
- Fairtrade Foundation** www.fairtrade.org.uk 020 7405 5942 - Has information on which fruits have Fairtrade status, and where you can buy them when making your own smoothies.
- SmoothieCast** www.smoothiecast.co.uk, mail@smoothiecast.co.uk - Smoothie recipes by dedicated smoothie enthusiasts! Also includes information on Fairtrade issues and the nutritional value of different fruits.
- Waste Online** www.wasteonline.org.uk/resources/InformationSheets/Plastics.htm 0845 331 31 31 - Provides information on recycling plastic, such as plastic bottles.

Company profiles

According to the **Ella's Kitchen** website all of the company's products were certified organic.¹² As Ella's Kitchen was a small to medium enterprise with an annual turnover of less than £5 million and marketed environmentally alternative products, ECRA awarded the company a clear mark for environmental reporting.

Fresh Trading Ltd only used fruit from suppliers who signed up to the minimum standards set out by the International Labour Organisation. Furthermore, the company favoured suppliers "approved by independent environmental and social auditors" and sourced fruit from farms with ethical accreditation schemes such as the one by the Rainforest Alliance.⁶ However, as the website did not contain a guarantee that all suppliers were paid a living wage and the independent auditors monitoring their working conditions were not named, ECRA awarded Fresh Trading its middle rating for supply chain policy.

PepsiCo was subject to a boycott call on the www.boycottbush.net website for donations to the US Republican Party.

The Juice Company sent ECRA a document in May 2007 which contained a section entitled 'Products & Suppliers', and a statement which read that the company aimed "to ensure that all the organisations [it] traded with met minimum ethical...standards [and the company] monitored and audited its suppliers to ensure

that [it] continued to work towards these goals". However, as no details were provided about the content of the company's supply chain policy despite ECRA's request for this information, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for supply chain policy.

BRAND	Ethiscore (out of 20)	Environment										Animals		People			Politics			+ve		COMPANY GROUP		
		Environmental Reporting	Nuclear Power	Climate Change	Pollution & Toxics	Habitats & Resources	Animal Testing	Factory Farming	Other Animal Rights	Human Rights	Workers' Rights	Supply Chain Policy	Irresponsible Marketing	Armaments	Genetic Engineering	Boycott Call	Political Activity	Anti-Social Finance	Company Ethos	Product Sustainability				
Fruit Hit Smoothie	16																				★	1	Natural Beverage Company Ltd	
Soma Organic Smoothie	16																					★	1	Soma Organic
Organic Smoothie Greens	14																						1	Dr Gillian McKeith
Smoothie Fruits	14																						1	Ella's Kitchen (Brands) Ltd
Innocent (CO2 labelled)	13	○																					0.5	Fresh Trading Ltd
The Big J Smoothie Smile	13	●																					1	The Juice Company (Europe) Ltd
Innocent (other)	12.5	○																						Fresh Trading Ltd
Bertrams Fruit & Veg	12	●																						Gebr. Bertrams GmbH & Co. KG
I Am Fresh Fruit Smoothie	12	●																						Wellness Foods Ltd
Serious Fruit Smoothies	11	●			○																			Jamaica Producers Group Ltd
PJ Smoothies	1.5	●		○	●	●		●	○	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		PepsiCo Inc

KEY ● bottom rating ○ middle rating □ top rating (no criticisms found) **Company Ethos:** ★ full mark ◻ half mark **Product Sustainability:** companies can receive a maximum of five positive marks for this category. **Ethiscore:** the higher the score, the better the company across the criticism categories (see www.ethicalconsumer.org/magazine/buyers/categories.htm or "Introduction to Ethical Consumer" booklet for more details).

© Photographer: Tracy Hebden | Agency: Dreamstime.com



smoothies

Dr Gillian McKeith

Marketing, 176 Finchley Road, Department 96, London, NW3 6BT

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2007)

According to the Dr Gillian McKeith company website viewed by ECRA on 1st May 2007 [www.drgillianmckeith.com], almost all of the company's products were certified organic. As the company was a small to medium enterprise with an annual turnover of less than £5 million and marketed environmentally or socially alternative products, ECRA awarded the Dr Gillian McKeith company a clear mark for environmental reporting. (ref: 1)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (May 2007)

A phone conversation on 1st May 2007 between an employee of the Dr Gillian McKeith company and ECRA revealed that the company did not have a supply chain policy. Consequently, ECRA awarded the the Dr Gillian McKeith company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 2)

Product sustainability

Organic product

Products certified organic (May 2007)

According to the Dr Gillian McKeith website viewed by ECRA on 1st May 2007 [www.drgillianmckeith.com], the company's Organic Smoothie range which included its Organic Smoothie Greens and Organic Smoothie Rejuvenate, were certified organic by Bio-Siegel, the eco label of Germany. (ref: 1)

Ella's Kitchen (Brands) Ltd

PO Box 2296, Reading, RG4 7WJ

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2007)

According to the Ella's Kitchen website viewed by ECRA on 26th April 2007 [www.ellaskitchen.co.uk], all of the company's products were certified organic. As Ella's Kitchen was a small to medium enterprise with an annual turnover of less than £5 million and marketed environmentally alternative products, ECRA awarded the company a clear mark for environmental reporting. (ref: 3)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (April 2007)

During a phone conversation with ECRA on 1st May 2007, an employee of Ella's Kitchen stated that the company did not have a specific supply chain policy. Consequently, ECRA awarded Ella's Kitchen its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 4)

Product sustainability

Organic product

Products certified organic (May 2007)

In a phone conversation with ECRA on the 1st May 2007, a representative of Ella's Kitchen stated that its Smoothie Fruits range was certified organic. (ref: 4)

Fresh Trading Limited

Fresh Trading Limited, Fruit Towers, 3, The Goldhawk Estate, Brackenbury Road, London, Greater London, W6 0BA, United Kingdom

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for Environmental reporting (May 2007)

According to the Fresh Trading's Sustainability Policy and 'Our Ethics' document sent to ECRA on May 1st 2007, the company had at least two dated and quantified future targets:

- by June 2007 to use only bottles made from post consumer recycled PET, a plastic regarded by some environmentalists as less harmful to the environment than, for example, PVC
- a 15% reduction in the company's carbon footprint for 2007

Both the Sustainability Policy and 'Our Ethics' documents showed a very good understanding of the company's main environmental impacts. For example, the latter highlighted the company's refusal to air freight fruit, and to make use of alternatives to fossil fuels where they existed.

However, although a representative of the company stated to ECRA in a phone call on May 1st 2007 that the carbon footprint of its products was verified by the Carbon Trust, and that a proportion of its fruit was Rainforest Alliance certified, no other named organisation which could verify Fresh Trading's environmental standards as a whole was included in the company's Sustainability Policy and 'Our Ethics' documents. Consequently, as the company was not classified at the time of writing as a small or medium enterprise due to having an annual turnover that exceeded £5 million, ECRA awarded Fresh Trading Limited its middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 5)

People

Human Rights

Fruit sourced from two oppressive regimes (May 2007)

According to the Fresh Trading Company's website viewed by ECRA on 2 May 2007 [www.innocentdrinks.co.uk], the company sourced oranges from Egypt in spring. The company also stated in a document sent to ECRA on the 1st May titled 'Our Ethics', that one of its suppliers was based in Indonesia. At the time of writing, both Egypt and Indonesia were considered by ECRA to be countries governed by an oppressive regime. As suppliers from these two countries were not certified Fairtrade, Fresh Trading did not receive a clear rating for Human Rights. (ref: 6)

Supply Chain Policy

Middle ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (May 2007)

According to a phone conversation with a representative of Fresh Trading Limited on May 1st 2007, ECRA found out that the company only procured fruit from suppliers who signed up to the minimum standards set out by the International Labour Organisation. Furthermore, according to the company's website viewed by ECRA on May 2nd 2007 [www.innocentdrinks.co.uk], the company favoured suppliers "approved by independent environmental and social auditors, and [paid] a premium for fruit from farms with the highest ethical accreditation such as the Rainforest Alliance [as well as] a premium to source fruit

locally if the quality and variety is available.” The website also stated that suppliers were visited by a procurement team to inspect and improve conditions, and educate suppliers on environmental and social best practice. However, the website did not contain a guarantee that workers were paid a living wage, and the independent monitoring of conditions in addition to those undertaken by the Rainforest Alliance, was not specifically named. At the time of writing, the Alliance’s agricultural certification systems were managed by the Sustainable Agriculture Network, a body which included the Rainforest Alliance. Consequently, ECRA awarded Fresh Trading its middle rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 7)

Product sustainability

Other Sustainability Features

Positive sustainability feature (May 2007)

According to the Innocent drinks’ website viewed by ECRA on May 2nd 2007 [www.innocentdrinks.co.uk], the Innocent Mangoes & Passion Fruits smoothie displayed the Carbon Trust’s Carbon Reduction Label. The label demonstrated a commitment from companies to reduce the carbon footprint of their products as carbon dioxide (CO₂) was a greenhouse gas that contributed to climate change. In order for a company to use the label, it had to agree to reduce its carbon footprint over two years from the date that the Carbon Reduction Label was first applied to the product. Consequently, the Mangoes & Passion Fruit smoothie received a Sustainability Feature mark from ECRA. (ref: 6)

Gebr. Bertrams GmbH & Co. KG

Anhovener Str 22-26, 41844 Wegberg, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2007)

No environmental report or policy was found on the website of Bertrams (<http://www.ohf.co.uk>) when viewed by a member of ECRA on 2nd May 2007. Bertrams did not respond to an enquiry by ECRA in May 2007 to provide its environmental report or policy. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 8)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (May 2007)

No supply chain policy, or other material relating to working conditions of the employees of Bertrams or those of its suppliers, was found when the company’s website (<http://www.bertrams-juice.de>) was viewed by a member of ECRA on 2 May 2007. Bertrams did not respond to an enquiry made by ECRA in May 2007 for this information. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 8)

Jamaica Producers Group Ltd

Producers House, 6A Oxford Rd, Kingston, 5, Jamaica

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2007)

The Jamaica Producers Group’s website, viewed by ECRA on May 2nd 2007 [www.jpjamaica.com], had a page titled ‘Statement of Quality and Environmental Policy’. It included statements

on the company’s environmental management programme such as ‘the rehabilitation of land through an intensive tree planting programme’ and ‘erosion control’. However, it did not contain at least two dated and quantified future targets, did not show a reasonable understanding of the company’s main environmental impacts, and was neither independently verified or dated. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 9)

Pollution & Toxics

River pollution (2005)

According to the February 2005 issue of the ENDS Report, in May 2001, more than 800 dead fish were counted in the river Mychydd in south Wales. It said orange sediment, together with whole oranges, peel and orange segments had been discharged to foul sewer by Sunjuice in breach of its effluent consent, and then been released into the river when the blocked sewer had fractured.

It said Sunjuice had been fined £2,000 and ordered to pay costs of £2,162, and had also paid out £900 to the Anglers’ Conservation Association in a civil claim. (ref: 10)

People

Workers’ Rights

Workers Rights 1 (2003)

According to a poster published by Banana Link in May 2003, Jamaica Producers was responsible for 18% of bananas imported into the UK that had been produced on plantations where workers were paid below the cost of a ‘basic food basket’, or just above. (ref: 11)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (May 2007)

The Jamaica Producers Group’s website viewed by ECRA on May 2nd 2007 [www.jpjamaica.com], included a page titled ‘Statement of Quality and Environmental Policy’ rather than a specific supply chain policy or code of conduct. The Policy stated that the company ‘strived to integrate...competent human resources, efficient cultural practices and protection of the health and welfare of workers’. However, no information was provided on how such practices would be implemented. Although ECRA received a response to a request for information relating to its supply chain, the information sent was the company’s ‘Statement of Quality and Environmental Policy’. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 9)

Natural Beverage Company Ltd

Castlemead, Lower Castle Street, Bristol, BSI 3AG

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2007)

According to a representative of the Natural Beverage Company during a phonecall with ECRA on 1st May 2007, the company did not have an environmental report or policy. However, all of the company’s products were certified Fairtrade, whereby certified farmers were encouraged to adopt organic practices. Furthermore, the Natural Beverage Company was a small to medium enterprise with an annual turnover of less than £5 million and marketed socially alternative products. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company a clear mark for environmental reporting. (ref: 12)

People

Human Rights

Best ECRA rating for supply chain policy (April 2007)

According to the Natural Beverage Company’s website viewed

by ECRA on 26 April 2007 [www.naturalbeverages.co.uk], all of the company's products were certified and labelled Fairtrade. Consequently, ECRA awarded the Natural Beverage Company its best rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 13)

Supply Chain Policy

(See also 'Best ECRA rating for supply chain policy' in Human Rights above.)

Politics

Company Ethos

(See also 'Best ECRA rating for supply chain policy' in Human Rights above.)

Product sustainability

Fairtrade Product

Fairtrade certified products (April 2007)

According to the Natural Beverage Company's website viewed by ECRA on 26th April 2007 [www.naturalbeverages.co.uk], all of its Fruit Hit smoothies were certified Fairtrade. (ref: 13)

PepsiCo Inc

Anderson Hill Road, Purchase, NY10577, USA

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environment report (May 2007)

Pete & Johnny Plc did not reply to a written request by ECRA in May 2007 for an environmental report or policy, nor did the company's website contain such a report when viewed by ECRA on May 2nd 2007 [www.pj-smoothies.co.uk/about]. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 14)

Climate Change

Poor climate change performance (2006)

According to an article in the Independent newspaper on 18th September 2006 and quoted on the website www.business-humanrights.org, research into the plans made by the largest global corporations to reduce climate change emissions and tackle global warming had revealed that Pepsi was amongst the worst performers. (ref: 15)

Pollution & Toxics

Subsidiary blacklisted for environmental violations in China (1 November 2006)

According to the Business Human Rights website viewed by ECRA on 1 November 2006, Pepsi Changchun was included on a blacklist produced by the Beijing-based Institute of Public and Environmental Affairs of multinationals which had violated Chinese environmental regulations. The list "criticized Changchun Pepsi for excessive discharge of waste water". (ref: 16)

Criticism of recycling evasion (2006)

According to the August 2006 issue of ENDS Report, in 2006 the UK Dept of the Environment had announced that it was closing a legal loophole which allowed non-UK companies selling products in the UK to evade producer recycling obligations. Walkers was said to have been using its Swiss company base to avoid such obligations in Britain. (ref: 17)

Pesticides in soft drinks (2006)

According to a press release by the India Resource Centre on 3rd August 2006, a survey by the Indian Centre for Science and Environment (CSE) found dangerous high levels of pesticides in Pepsi's soft drinks in India. The study found a "cocktail of between three to five different pesticides in all samples" which were, on average, 24 times higher than European Union standards. The study found high levels of the carcinogen Lindane as well

as three other pesticides. The CSE had found similar levels three years before. (ref: 18)

Habitats & Resources

Groundwater depletion in India (2004)

The Ecologist July/August 2003 reported that two rural community in the southern Indian state of Kerala had accused Pepsi and another drinks manufacturer of depleting local groundwater and triggering water shortages due to operations at their bottling plants. A village had revoked the water use permit of a Pepsi plant. The villagers protests had begun at the time of the report to receive support from Indian national environmental organisations. (ref: 19)

Disputes over Indian water extraction (2005)

According to the June 2005 issue of Corporate Watch, Pepsi had had its license to extract water for its bottling plant in Pudusseri, India, revoked by local authorities after the surrounding area started to suffer from severe water scarcity. (ref: 20)

Irreparable damage to sensitive ecological area (2002)

In September 2002, BBC News reported that Pepsi had been one of a number of companies to be fined by the Indian government for painting advertisements onto rock faces in the Himalayas. It was fined US\$4,000 by a committee who said the paintings caused irreparable damage to an ecologically sensitive area. (ref: 21)

Animals

Factory farming

Meat products (2006)

According to the company website www.pepsico.com, viewed by ECRA in September 2006, Frito-Lay snacks range included a number of meat snacks made from meat not labelled as free range or organic. (ref: 22)

Other Animal Rights

Supporting animal abuse through advertising (16 February 2005)

According to The Guardian website (www.guardian.co.uk), the Captive Animals Protection Society (CAPS) was threatening to call a boycott over Pepsi's television advert featuring a chimp, on 16th February 2005. The Campaign Officer for CAPS was quoted saying Pepsi had given "a very basic, standard reply" saying it filmed the ad in Spain, that a trainer was used and that the four-year-old chimp's welfare needs were met. CAPS commented that a four-year-old chimp should be with its family. (ref: 23)

Animal cruelty (2003)

According to an article that was posted on the Responsible Shopper website (www.responsibleshopper.org) by PETA in June 2003, PETA had appealed to the US Fish and Wildlife Service to investigate PepsiCo's Buena Park, Calif., warehouse. It said PepsiCo had admitted to hiring a pest-control company to line its warehouse with sticky glue traps, which kill animals slowly and painfully. "If PepsiCo were found to have set these traps during the week of May 26th [2003], PETA argued that [it] would have been in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act." (ref: 24)

People

Human Rights

(See also 'Disputes over Indian water extraction' in Habitats & Resources above.)

Operations in eight oppressive regimes (April 2007)

According to the PepsiCo website viewed in April 2007 [www.pepsico.com], the company had operations in countries which were considered by ECRA at the time of writing to be governed by oppressive regimes: China; Egypt; Guatemala; Pakistan; Philippines; Russia; Thailand and Vietnam. (ref: 22)

Subsidiaries in oppressive regimes and tax havens (2005)

According to Pepsi's annual report for the year ending 31st December 2005, in that year Pepsi had subsidiary companies in

the following countries regarded by ECRA as having oppressive regimes: Guatemala, China, Egypt, Russia, Kazakhstan, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Pepsi also listed subsidiaries in the following territories regarded by ECRA as tax havens: Panama, Guatemala, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, the Bahamas, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands Antilles, Liechtenstein, the Philippines, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Barbados, Singapore and Costa Rica. (ref: 25)

Workers' Rights

Workers' rights violations in Poland (2006)

According to the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF) website (www.iuf.org) on 31st March 2006, the labour movement was showing solidarity with the union at PepsiCo's Frito-Lay snack food plant in Grodziesk, Poland on International Women's Day. The union was planning to demonstrate outside a Warsaw court where the case of 8 workers was being held. "These women, who were victims of, or witnesses to, sexual harassment by a supervisor at the plant, were either dismissed or forced under pressure to resign in late December 2004." When the union filed sexual harassment charges in January 2005, the company was said to have attacked the union seeking to defend them. For example, local union leader Slawomir Zagrajek was sacked on December 14th 2005 due to an article critical of the union that was published in the tabloid Super Express. The article was said to have alleged that the union had fewer members than it claimed to, and therefore the chairman was illegally benefited from his salary as a full-time union official. IUF said that the union had collected dues rather than a check-off system as there was an anti-union climate at the plant. The management responded by bringing in a team to extract statements on union membership from staff. This information was not given to union officials, who have contested this illegal and intimidating behaviour. The company claimed its findings were consistent with the tabloid article, and sacked Zagrajek. On 13th January 2006, management distributed a letter to all employees announcing their withdrawal from the union. Employees were instructed to sign the letter, and return them within five days. (ref: 26)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (May 2007)

Pete & Johnny Plc did not reply to a written request by ECRA in May 2007 for a supply chain policy governing worker conditions at production sites, nor could any of this information be found on Pete & Johnny Plc's website viewed by ECRA in May 2007 [www.pj-smoothies.co.uk/about]. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 14)

Irresponsible Marketing

Sugar Puffs contained 49% sugar (2003)

In the Food Commission supported Parents' Jury February 2003 Children's awards, in the breakfast cereal category, Quaker Sugar Puffs was one of the runners up in 'Breakfast Battles' category. It contained 49% sugar, which was considered high in comparison to the government's guidelines of 10% maximum sugar content. (ref: 27)

Sued for fraud and breach of warranty (April 2004)

According to issue 65 of the Food Magazine, April 2004, PepsiCo was one of twelve defendants in Lawsuits against companies which either manufactured aspartame or used it in products for human consumption. The suits were filed in three Californian courts in April 2004 and alleged that the companies committed 'fraud and breach of warranty' by adding the chemical to products 'in full knowledge that aspartame (was) a neurotoxic'. Plaintiffs were calling for an injunction to stop companies producing, manufacturing, processing, selling or using the artificial sweetener, the consumption of which had been linked by critics to conditions such as migraine, vision loss, multiple sclerosis and chronic

fatigue. (ref: 28)

Marketing unhealthy food to US children (2004)

In March 2005 Multinational Monitor reported that PepsiCo had been criticised for marketing unhealthy foods to children. The company was said to have exclusive sales deals with schools to sell sugary drinks and salty crisps. It was also said to be one of a number of highly criticised food companies to be trying to promote themselves as healthy by advocating exercise, rather than diet, as the main way to a healthy lifestyle. It was said to have reached 3 million students by sending free exercise information to schools in 2004, and in March 2005 to have targeted all 15,000 middle schools in America with a 'get-fit' message. The company was also said to have established a website entitled 'healthispower.net' which advocated unhealthy snacks such as Doritos and Pepsi as part of a balanced diet. (ref: 29)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

Aunt Jemima products contained GM ingredients (May 2007)

According to the Greenpeace www.truefoodnow.org website viewed in May 2007, the following varieties of Aunt Jemima baking mixes sold in the US, contained genetically engineered ingredients: Complete Pancake & Waffle Mix, Buttermilk Pancake & Waffle Mix, Cornbread Mix, Easy Mix Coffee Cake. (ref: 30)

Near East mixes contained GM ingredients (May 2007)

According to the Greenpeace www.truefoodnow.org website viewed in May 2007, a number of different varieties of Near East meal mixes and sauce packets sold in the US contained genetically engineered ingredients. (ref: 30)

Rold Gold Pretzels sold in US likely to contain GM ingredients (May 2007)

According to the Greenpeace www.truefoodnow.org website viewed in May 2007, Frito-Lay's Rold Gold Pretzels sold in the US were likely to contain genetically engineered ingredients. (ref: 30)

Boycott Call

(See also 'Supporting animal abuse through advertising' in Other Animal Rights above.)

Boycott call for Republican donations (2004)

PepsiCo was listed on the Boycott Bush website (www.boycottbush.net) viewed in July 2004 as one of the top twenty-five donors to the US Republican Party. The website called for a boycott to the top twenty-five donors until George Bush decided to fully implement the Kyoto protocol on climate change. The website argued that although the donor companies may not themselves have put direct pressure on the Republicans re Kyoto, they must still bear some responsibility as their funds helped to elect the Republican government. (ref: 31)

Political Activities

Member of National Foreign Trade Council (22 February 2004)

According to the website of the National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC), www.nftc.org, visited on 22/1/04, PepsiCo Inc. as listed as a director. The NFTC's motto was 'Advancing Global Commerce' and it also claimed to be "the only business association dedicated solely to trade policy, export finance, international tax, and human resource issues on behalf of its members". It also stated the organization advocated open world markets and fought against protectionist legislation and policies. It also offered rapid and effective response to fast-moving legislative and policy developments by a team with a reputation for tackling tough issues and getting results, and participation in NFTC-led business coalitions on major international trade and tax issues. These were listed as benefits of membership of the organization. (ref: 32)

Member of World Economic Forum (May 2007)

According to the organisation's website www.weforum.org, viewed by ECRA in May 2007, PepsiCo was a member of the World Economic Forum. This was considered by ECRA to be a high level corporate lobby group which exerted undue corporate influence, to the potential detriment of the environment and human and animal rights. (ref: 33)

Member of one international lobby group (May 2007)

According to the organisation's website www.wbcsd.org, viewed by ECRA in May 2007, in 2007 PepsiCo was a member of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. This was regarded by ECRA as an international corporate lobby group which exerted undue corporate influence on policy-makers in favour of market solutions that were potentially detrimental to the environment and human rights. (ref: 34)

Anti-Social Finance

Subsidiaries in tax havens in order to avoid tax (1 July 2006)

A July 2006 report on corporate tax avoidance by the ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions), Pepsi was one of a number of companies which had increased its subsidiaries in tax havens by several hundred or thousand percent in the past five years. The report claimed that companies deliberately set up subsidiaries in tax havens in order to avoid paying corporate taxes. (ref: 35)

Subsidiaries in tax havens 2003 (2004)

According to Who Owns Whom 2003 / 2004, PepsiCo had subsidiaries in the Bahamas, Bermuda, Ireland, Switzerland and Panama. These are known tax havens. (ref: 36)

Excessive directors' remuneration (2003)

According to the American Federation of Labor- Congress of Industrial Organisations Executive Pay Watch Database (www.alfcio.org) Steven S. Reinemund, Chairman and CEO of PepsiCo Inc. raked in \$27,375,399 in total compensation including stock option grants from PepsiCo in 2003. It also said "from previous years' stock option grants, the PepsiCo Inc. executive cashed out \$11,656,554 in stock option exercises. And Steven S. Reinemund has another \$48,933,554 in unexercised stock options from the previous years." (ref: 37)

Soma Organic

Managing Director, PO Box 431, Brighton, East Sussex, BN2 9RX, United Kingdom

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best ECRA rating for environment report (October 2006)

In a telephone call on 26 October 2006 Soma confirmed that the company had a turnover of less than £5 million and all company products were certified organic by the Soil Association - the company therefore received an exemption from environmental reporting as a small company providing innovative environmental products. (ref: 38)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Smaller company with positive policy addressing supply chain issues (1 November 2006)

In an email dated 1st November 2006, Soma stated that it had discussed supply chain policy issues with its main supplier and had received verbal assurances - the company stated that it sought to gain Fair Trade certification in 2006/2007. As the Soma had a turnover significantly under £5 million, hence, was a smaller

company with positive policy addressing supply chain issues, it received a clear mark under ECRA's supply chain policy rating. (ref: 39)

Politics

Company Ethos

All products certified organic (May 2007)

Soma Organic's website when viewed by ECRA in May 2007 showed that its whole product range was certified organic by the Soil Association. (ref: 40)

Product sustainability

Organic product

Organic product (May 2007)

According to Soma Organic's website when viewed by ECRA in May 2007, all of its Organic Smoothie range were certified organic by the UK's Soil Association. (ref: 40)

The Juice Company (Europe Ltd)

Press, The Big J™, 19A Thorold Road, London, N22 8YE, UK

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2007)

No environmental report or policy was found on the website of the Juice Company (<http://www.thejuicecompany.com>) when viewed by a member of ECRA on 2nd May 2007. However, the Juice Company did respond to a written request by ECRA in April 2007 to provide its environmental report or policy. Although the document sent stated that "all of [the company's] suppliers worked to an environmental policy and a majority worked to ISO 14000 or IPCC environmental standards...", and showed a reasonable understanding of the company's environmental impact, for example, it identified that all of the Juice Company's "raw materials were transported by ship" rather than by air freight, the document did not include at least two dated and quantified future targets. Furthermore, no mention was made in the document that the Juice Company's environmental policy and reporting system was independently verified. Consequently, ECRA awarded the Juice Company its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 41)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (May 2007)

No supply chain policy, or other material relating to working conditions of the employees of The Juice Company or those of its suppliers, was found when the company's website (<http://www.thejuicecompany.com>) was viewed by a member of ECRA on 2 May 2007. In response to a request by ECRA in April 2007 for details of the Juice Company's supply chain policy, it did send ECRA a document in May 2007 which contained a section titled 'Products & Suppliers', and a statement which read that the company aimed "to ensure that all the organisations [it] traded with met minimum ethical...standards [and the company] monitored and audited its suppliers to ensure that [it] continued to work towards these goals". However, as no details were provided about the content of the company's supply chain policy despite ECRA specifically asking the Juice Company for this information, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 41)

Product sustainability

Animal Welfare Features

Vegetarian Society approved product (May 2007)

According to the Juice Company's website viewed by ECRA on May 2nd 2007 [www.thebigj.com], all products in its Smoothie Smile range were Vegetarian Society approved. (ref: 41)

Wellness Foods Limited

PR/Media, Orchard, Lea, Winkfield Lane, Windsor, SL4 4RU

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Environmental reporting (May 2007)

No environmental report or policy was found on the website of Orchard House Foods Limited (<http://www.ohf.co.uk>) when viewed by a member of ECRA on 2nd May 2007. Orchard House did not respond to a written request by ECRA in April 2007 to provide its environmental report or policy. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 42)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Supply chain policy (May 2007)

No supply chain policy, or other material relating to working conditions of the employees of Orchard House Foods or those of its suppliers, was found when the company's website (<http://www.ohf.co.uk>) was viewed by a member of ECRA on 3 May 2007. Orchard House did not respond to written and phone call requests made by ECRA in May 2007 for this information. Consequently, ECRA awarded the company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 42)

References

- 1 - Dr Gillian McKeith: www.drgillianmckeith.com (1 May 2007) (311479)
- 2 - Dr Gillian McKeith: Phone conversation with ECRA (1 May 2007) (311481)
- 3 - Ella's Kitchen (Brands) Ltd Corporate Communications: www.ellaskitchen.co.uk (26 April 2007) (311373)
- 4 - Ella's Kitchen (Brands) Ltd Corporate Communications: Phone conversation with ECRA (1 May 2007) (311558)
- 5 - Fresh Trading Limited Corporate Communications: Sustainability and Ethics Policy (April 2007) (311617)
- 6 - Fresh Trading Limited Corporate Communications: www.innocentdrinks.co.uk (2 May 2007) (311622)
- 7 - Fresh Trading Limited Corporate Communications: Phone conversation with ECRA (1 May 2007) (311632)
- 8 - Gebr. Bertrams GmbH & Co. KG: www.bertrams-juice.de (2 May 2007) (311815)
- 9 - Jamaica Producers Group: www.jpjamaica.com (2 May 2007) (311672)
- 10 - The Serious Food Company (aka Sunjuice Ltd) Corporate Communications: www.sunjuice.co.uk (4 March 2005) (251772)
- 11 - Banana Links - poster: 1 May 2003 (10934)
- 12 - Natural Beverage Company Ltd Corporate Communications: Phone conversation with ECRA (26 April 2007) (311383)
- 13 - Natural Beverage Company Ltd Corporate Communications: www.naturalbeverages.co.uk (26 April 2007) (311375)
- 14 - Pete & Johnny Plc Corporate Communications: www.pj-smoothies.co.uk/about (2 May 2007) (311658)
- 15 - www.business-humanrights.org: World's leading companies lack plan on climate change (18 September 2006) (298179)

- 16 - Business & Human Rights Resource Centre: China: Subsidiaries of multinationals including Panasonic, PepsiCo, Nestlé on "blacklist" of polluti (300976)
- 17 - ENDS Report: 379 (August 2006) (August 2006) (296361)
- 18 - India Resource Center - <http://indiaresource.org>: Dangerous Pesticides in Coca-Cola and Pepsi in India (3 August 2006) (305631)
- 19 - Ecologist, The: July/August 2003 (1 July 2003) (3341)
- 20 - Corporate Watch newsletter: issue 24 (June/July 2005) (June 2005) (263431)
- 21 - BBC News Website www.bbc.co.uk: 17 September 2002 (1268)
- 22 - PepsiCo Inc Corporate Communications: www.pepsico.com (April 2007) (298182)
- 23 - Guardian Unlimited / Guardian website www.guardian.co.uk: Activists threaten Pepsi over chimp ads (22 February 2005) (250219)
- 24 - Responsible Shopper website: PepsiCo (4 July 2004) (228596)
- 25 - PepsiCo Inc Corporate Communications: Annual Report 2005/6 (21 September 2006) (298188)
- 26 - IUF web site www.iuf.org: International Women's Day: Fight Sexual Harassment, Anti-Union Aggression at PepsiCo Poland (4 March 2005) (292344)
- 27 - Parents' Jury www.parentsjury.org: 7 July 2003 (9300)
- 28 - Food Magazine: Issue 65 (1 April 2004) (229300)
- 29 - Multinational Monitor: Vol 26 no 3&4 (March-April 2005) (March 2005) (262850)
- 30 - True Food Now website www.truefoodnow.org: www.truefoodnow.org/shoppersguide/guide_printable.html#snacks (15 May 2007) (312490)
- 31 - Boycott Bush website www.boycottbush.net: 2 July 2004 (228314)
- 32 - National Foreign Trade Council www.nftc.org: 22 February 2004 (221632)
- 33 - World Economic Forum website www.weforum.org: Industry Partners (8 May 2007) (311901)
- 34 - www.wbcds.org: Member companies list May 2007 (8 May 2007) (311898)
- 35 - Report: Having their cake and eating it too (8 August 2006) (295057)
- 36 - Who Owns Whom: 2003/2004 (1 January 2003) (11972)
- 37 - Executive Pay Watch Database: www.alfcio.org (4 July 2004) (228516)
- 38 - Triangle Wholefoods Collective Ltd Corporate Communications: 26 October 2006 (300377)
- 39 - Soma Organic Corporate Communications: Soma Organic (1 November 2006) (300889)
- 40 - Soma Organic Corporate Communications: www.somaorganic.co.uk (May 2007) (312485)
- 41 - The Juice Co. (Europe Ltd): www.thejuicecompany.com/index.html (2 May 2007) (311664)
- 42 - Orchard House Foods Limited Corporate Communications: <http://www.ohf.co.uk> (2 May 2007) (311783)