

# Cheers or boos?

© Photographer: Tomas Loucky | Agency: Dreamstime.com

Dr Nicola Scott looks at the spirit producers which might give you an ethical hangover



best buys

It's not long before alcohol for Christmas parties will be bought and gifts considered for the whisky or brandy connoisseurs in the family. But during this period of over-indulgence, it's still important to think about how our purchasing behaviour will benefit drinks' firms whose ethics may or may not be as good spirited as the products they promote.

## Industry groups

When Ethical Consumer last reported on spirits back in 2004 (issue 87), we criticised industry organisations such as the US-based Century Council<sup>1</sup> and the UK-based Portman Group, which claim to promote responsible alcohol consumption. We argued then that they also lobbied for less regulation of the industry's advertising. The Portman Group's latest Code of Practice (4th Edition) discourages the promotion of alcohol to under 18s, "irresponsible" and "immoderate" consumption, and "any suggestion that drinking can lead to social success or popularity."<sup>2</sup> However, the Portman Group recently voiced its opposition to a ban on adverts for alcohol before the 9pm watershed proposed by the UK organisation Alcohol Concern. In response to this call, the Group's Chief Executive stated: "The advertising rules, which were toughened two years ago, ban adverts from targeting or appealing to under-18s. Completely shielding this age group from any images of alcohol is not helping them grow up with sensible and balanced attitudes to drinking."<sup>3</sup> We reviewed the websites of Portman Group member companies covered in this report.<sup>4,5,6</sup> While these sites included some information about responsible alcohol consumption, no mention was made of the recommended weekly amount of alcohol units to be consumed, nor of the diseases which can be caused by alcohol abuse.

## Unethical promotion?

Despite government regulation on alcohol advertising to under 18s, advertising by alcohol producers is prevalent in sectors which can attract interest from this age group, such as festival sponsorship<sup>7</sup> and product placement in films.<sup>8,9</sup> Although the Portman Group's code specifies that sponsorship is only allowed where no more than a quarter of participants, the audience or spectators

can be under 18,<sup>2</sup> such a figure is difficult to quantify in practice, especially where product placements are included in films certified to be suitable for under 18s.

## Industry expansion

Spirit producers are realising their potential to exploit untapped markets in developing economies. Pernod-Ricard's Annual Report 2005/2006 identified how its sales in China had increased in 2006 by 50%, whilst its Venezuelan market grew by 20%.<sup>10</sup> Although this in itself is not a process which receives negative marks on the scores table, expanding the market into countries which may have fewer health and social resources to cope with potential alcohol-related problems, is a contentious issue. "Alcohol-related deaths almost doubled in the UK from 1991-2005," according to a report by the National Office of Statistics in 2006.<sup>11</sup>

## Supply chain policy and environmental issues

The sector is dominated by a handful of multinationals, many of which operate in other markets such as clothing (Groupe Arnault, UB Group), and products for the home (Fortune Brands). So it is disappointing to see on the table that only one company received a best rating for supply chain policy, while only two had good environmental reports. With rum, for example, the principle ingredient is sugar, and if you buy ethically sourced sugar you might want to consider whether your favourite rum company states how its key ingredient is produced. And opting for organic spirits ensures that only organic ingredients are used in the fermentation process of spirits. The UK's Soil Association has criticised non-organic production processes: "conventional vodka is made from grain produced in systems usually reliant upon multiple applications of pesticides and artificial fertilisers."<sup>12</sup> The table focuses on the most widely available brands; more products are rated on our online shopping guide - [www.ethicscore.org](http://www.ethicscore.org).

**Utkins Fairtrade Rum** from the London & Scottish Company (01483 894650), was an overall Best Buy. Ethical Consumer also recommends **Juniper Green Organic Gin**, **UK5 Organic Vodka** and **Highland Harvest Whisky** from the same company.





## Company profiles

According to the website of the UK-based **Rock Around the Blockade**,<sup>13</sup> the organisation's boycott of Bacardi was ongoing. The website stated that the boycott was launched in August 1999 because "Bacardi [backed] the US blockade of Cuba and [funded] the right-wing Miami mafia, which had committed repeated acts of terrorism against Cuba."

**The National Mobilization Against Sweatshops** (NMASS) website<sup>14</sup> stated that the boycotts against Donna Karan and DKNY, owned by the Group Arnault, were ongoing. The boycott had been called by NMASS due to conditions in a factory in New York producing clothes for DKNY. Employees worked 10 hours a day 6 days a week with a 40 minute break at midday. Workers were not allowed to use the bathroom unless they had finished their quotas and they were not allowed to look up or speak to each other.

### A company to be merry about

At the time of writing only one company reviewed, the Organic Spirits Company (a subsidiary of London & Scottish International), had a product which was both certified Fairtrade and organic - Utkins Fairtrade Rum. All of the Organic Spirits Company products were certified organic. Given that the annual profits of most of the companies on the table run into millions of pounds, they could spend more of this money on establishing and verifying responsible supply chain and environmental management systems.

© Illustration: Martha Paulos www.gettyimages.com

BRAND	Ethiscore (out of 20)	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	COMPANY GROUP
<b>Brandy &amp; cognac</b>																					
Brandy Domecq	8.5	●								●	●	●		○		○	○				Pernod-Ricard SA
Martell	8.5	●								●	●	●		○		○	○				Pernod-Ricard SA
Courvoisier	7.5	●							●	○	●	●	○	○				○			Fortune Brands
Hennessy	6				●		●		●	●	●	○		○	○		○				Groupe Arnault SA
<b>Gin</b>																					
Juniper Green Organic	14	●										●							★ 1		London & Scottish International
Plymouth	10.5									●	●	●								○	V&S Group
Kensington	9.5	●						●		○	●	●		○			○	○			United Breweries (UB) Group
Seagram's	8.5	●								●	●	●		○			○	○			Pernod-Ricard SA
Gordon's	6.5				●	○	○			●	●	●		○			○	○			Diageo plc
<b>Rum</b>																					
Utkins Fairtrade [O]	15	●										●							★ 2		London & Scottish International
Papagayo Organic	14	●										●							★ 1		London & Scottish International
Cruzan	10.5									●	●	●								○	V&S Group
Havana Club	8.5	●								●	●	●		○			○	○			Pernod-Ricard SA
Bacardi	6.5	●			○					○	●	●		○	●	●	●				Bacardi & Company Limited
Captain Morgan	6.5				●	○	○			●	●	●		○			○	○			Diageo plc
Morgan's Spiced	6.5				●	○	○			●	●	●		○			○	○			Diageo plc
<b>Vodka</b>																					
UK5 Organic	14	●										●							★ 1		London & Scottish International
Absolut	10.5									●	●	●								○	V&S Group
Vladivar	9.5	●						●		○	●	●		○			○	○			United Breweries (UB) Group
Smirnoff	6.5				●	○	○			●	●	●		○			○	○			Diageo plc
<b>Whisky</b>																					
Highland Harvest [O]	14	●										●							★ 1		London & Scottish International
Highland Park	13	●																			The Robertson Trust
Whyte & Mackay	9.5	●						●		○	●			○				○			United Breweries (UB) Group
Teacher's	7.5	●						●		○	●	○	○	○				○			Fortune Brands
Johnnie Walker	6.5				●	○	○			●	●	●		○			○	○			Diageo plc

**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/ratings/ethicalratings.htm](http://www.ethicalconsumer.org/magazine/ratings/ethicalratings.htm) or "Introduction to Ethical Consumer" booklet for more details).

**References** 1 Founding companies include Bacardi, Diageo and Fortune Brands [www.centurycouncil.org/](http://www.centurycouncil.org/) viewed 7/9/07 2 Code of Practice, [www.portman-group.org.uk](http://www.portman-group.org.uk) viewed 7/9/07 3 Press release by the Portman Group 28/8/07 [www.portman-group.org.uk](http://www.portman-group.org.uk) viewed 7/9/07 4 [www.bacardi.com](http://www.bacardi.com) viewed 7/9/07 5 [www.beamglobal.com](http://www.beamglobal.com) part of Fortune Brands viewed 7/9/07 6 [www.diageo.com](http://www.diageo.com) viewed 7/9/07 7 For example, the Bacardi Stage at the 2007 V festival] 8 ABSOLUT's placement in 'Zoolander', certificate 12, Motion Picture Placement [www.mppusa.com/slideshow17.htm](http://www.mppusa.com/slideshow17.htm) viewed 7/9/07 9 Smirnoff's placement in the latest James Bond film 'Casino Royale', certificate 12, [www.sonypictures.co.uk/movies/casinoroyale/partners](http://www.sonypictures.co.uk/movies/casinoroyale/partners) viewed 7/9/07 10 Pernot-Ricard Annual Report 2005/2006, p34 and p40, respectively [www.pernod-ricard.com](http://www.pernod-ricard.com) viewed 5/9/07 11 News Release 7 November 2006, [www.statistics.gov.uk/pdidir/aldeaths1106.pdf](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pdidir/aldeaths1106.pdf) viewed 7/9/07 12 'Wine, Beer and Spirits – Common questions and answers', November 2005, [www.soilassociation.org](http://www.soilassociation.org) viewed 7/9/07 13 [www.ratb.org.uk](http://www.ratb.org.uk) viewed 22/8/07 14 [www.nmass.org](http://www.nmass.org) viewed 7/9/07

# spirits

## Bacardi & Company Limited

65 Pitts Bay Rd., Pembroke, HM 08, Bermuda

### Environment

#### Environmental Reporting

##### Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (August 2007)

According to the website of the import, sales, and marketing arm of Bacardi Limited ([www.bacardilimited.com](http://www.bacardilimited.com)), viewed by ECRA on 22 August 2007, the company had an 'Environment, Health and Safety Policy'. The policy outlined the environmental responsibilities of the company which included goals to:

- "Comply with all environment, health and safety laws and regulations.
- Prevent accidents and environmental incidents.
- Minimize emissions, effluents and waste at all stages of [the company's] product life cycle.
- Fulfil [the above] commitments by dedicating sufficient resources, establishing clear objectives and targets and maintaining management systems to deliver them throughout [the] organization."

However, the policy did not contain at least two, dated and quantified future targets, nor show a reasonable understanding of the company's main environmental impacts. Furthermore, the policy did not specify that the company's environmental targets would be independently verified. Consequently, ECRA gave Bacardi & Company Limited its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 1)

### Pollution & Toxics

#### Pollution enforcement order (2005)

According to a news story on the 26th September 2005 issue of the Environment News Service, Bacardi had been ordered by the US Environmental Protection Agency to cut its pollution after it was found to have breached limits for wastewater discharges from its rum distillery in Puerto Rico. The company was said to have been issued an administrative order for its violations, which included discharges of copper, lead and zinc. (ref: 2)

### People

#### Human Rights

##### Marketing campaign with Playboy (September 2002)

According to an article in the New York Times, "Polishing the Snifter, Dusting Off the Ears" (29 September 2002), Dewars, a subsidiary of Bacardi, ran a multimillion-dollar marketing campaign with Playboy Enterprises. The article noted that "the campaign also includes an online link to the contest from the Dewar's Web site, [www.dewars.com](http://www.dewars.com), explaining why "Dewar's is like great sex" and how Miss August 2001 enjoys her Scotch." ECRA considered promotion of pornography to be a human rights issue." (ref: 3)

##### Operations in one oppressive regime (August 2007)

According to the Hoovers website viewed by ECRA on 23 August 2007 ([www.hoovers.com](http://www.hoovers.com)), Bacardi & Company Limited operated a subsidiary in China. At the time of writing, China was considered by ECRA to be governed by an oppressive regime. (ref: 4)

##### Operations in six oppressive regimes (2002)

According to the Bacardi website in January 2002, the company had operations in the following countries, considered by ECRA to be oppressive regimes: China, Russia, Turkey, Brazil, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela. (ref: 5)

### Supply Chain Policy

#### Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (August 2007)

According to the website of the import, sales, and marketing arm of Bacardi Limited viewed by ECRA on 22 August 2007 ([www.bacardilimited.com](http://www.bacardilimited.com)), the company had an 'Environment, Health and Safety' web page which included a section titled 'Codes of Practice'. It stated that by March 2008 all of its facilities would be compliant with 'Global Standards Codes of Practice'. However, as these "standards" were not specified, and as no mention was made that these standards would be independently monitored by a third party, ECRA gave Bacardi & Company Limited its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 1)

### Irresponsible Marketing

#### Youth marketing of alcohol (2004)

According to the report "Clicking with Kids: alcohol marketing and youth on the internet" by the Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth at Georgetown University, Bacardi was one of a number of alcohol brands which had websites designed in a way which would appeal to underage drinkers. Bacardi's sites were said to include such youth-friendly elements as: interactive games like air hockey, 'kissing in the dark,' 'party snake' and 'iceberg power boarding,' screensavers and wallpapers described as 'turning the user's PC into a billboard for the product,' e-postcards, high levels of animation and party planners. Although many sites were said to have a 'card' entrance which asked the user to declare their age, this was said to be ineffective as there was no way of verifying the answers. In the six months to December 2003, the report stated that over half of the visitors to the Bacardi.com website admitted to being under 21. (ref: 3)

### Politics

#### Genetic Engineering

##### Lack of an explicit GM-free policy (August 2007)

When the Bacardi & Company's website was viewed by ECRA in August 2007 ([www.bacardi.com](http://www.bacardi.com)), no information was included to indicate that the company had a GM-free policy. (ref: 6)

#### Boycott Call

##### Ongoing worldwide boycott (August 2007)

According to the website of the UK-based Rock Around the Blockade ([www.ratb.org.uk](http://www.ratb.org.uk)) on 22 August 2007, the organisation's boycott of Bacardi was ongoing. The website stated that the boycott was launched in August 1999 because "Bacardi [backed] the US blockade of Cuba and [funded] the right-wing Miami mafia, which had committed repeated acts of terrorism against Cuba." (ref: 7)

#### Political Activities

##### Illegal donations to US Republicans (September 2004)

According to the October 2004 issue of Multinational Monitor, eight corporations, including Bacardi USA, had been indicted in September 2004 on charges of illegally funnelling corporate money into Texas House of Representatives races. It said the companies had been accused of making illegal contributions to the Texans for a Republican Majority Political Action Committee, ranging from \$25,000 to \$100,000. (ref: 8)

##### Donations to US right wing (2002)

According to a report by the Interhemispheric Resource Centre, read on the web in January 2002, Bacardi & Co was listed as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Cuban American National Foundation, a political organisation which was described as "in line with and supportive of right wing and neoconservative groups"

in the USA, and as having supported right wing measures such as US government bills in support of the Nicaraguan Contras. It was also said to have made donations to Republican presidential campaigns and to have donated money to the electoral campaigns of right wing Republicans such as Jesse Helms, author of a bill which extended the terms of the US blockade of Cuba. (ref: 9)

#### **Indictment for illegal political contributions (April 2005)**

According to the political donations research website [www.buyblue.org](http://www.buyblue.org), viewed by ECRA in May 2005, in April 2005 Bacardi had donated \$3000 to the legal defence fund of the organiser of Texans for a Republican Majority and Americans for a Republican Majority, a Republican organiser and lobbyist who had allegedly been widely criticised for corrupt practices and fundraising. Bacardi was also said to have been indicted for making illegal contributions to Texans for a Republican Majority. (ref: 10)

#### **Anti-Social Finance**

(See also 'Illegal donations to US Republicans' in Political Activities above.)

#### **Subsidiaries in three tax havens (August 2007)**

According to the Hoovers website, viewed by ECRA on 23 August 2007 ([www.hoovers.com](http://www.hoovers.com)), Bacardi & Company Limited had business operations in the following countries, which at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be tax havens: Bahamas; Bermuda; and Singapore. (ref: 11)

## **Diageo plc**

*8 Henrietta Place, London, W1G 0NB, United Kingdom*

### **Environment**

#### **Environmental Reporting**

##### **Best ECRA rating for Environmental reporting (August 2007)**

Diageo's website ([www.diageo.com](http://www.diageo.com)) contained a document entitled Corporate Citizenship Report 2006 when it was viewed by ECRA in August 2007. It contained future quantified targets on energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, water use and solid waste landfill. It was also independently verified by the Corporate Citizenship Company. Consequently, the company received ECRA's best rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 13)

#### **Pollution & Toxics**

##### **Factory pollution in Cameroon (2006)**

According to the human rights monitoring website [www.business-humanrights.org](http://www.business-humanrights.org), viewed on 17th August 2006, in an article translated from a French original in *Le Quotidien Mutations*, in 2006 a Guinness factory in Cameroon had been found to be allowing green effluent to spill down a cliff and into a residential area, sparking fears for the residents. The company was also said to have been fined 5 million CFA Francs in 2001 for the pollution but it was suggested that the company had not improved its effluent systems. (ref: 14)

##### **Fine for oil pollution (2005)**

According to the January 2006 issue of ENDS Report, in 2006 Diageo had been fined £10,000 over an incident in February 2005 where the company was found to have polluted a Scottish salmon river with oil. The oil was said to have come from a leak in a storage tank which did not have a proper bund to prevent its toxic contents from escaping from the site. (ref: 15)

##### **Pollution and fine in Cameroon (1 January 2003)**

According to Diageo's Corporate Citizenship Report 2003, in 2003 four of the company's sites reported pollution incidents. The report said that 30,000 litres of fuel oil had spilled into the storm water drainage system of a brewery in Cameroon. Diageo said that failure of the bunding around the oil tank contributed to the seriousness of the spill and added that "the oil polluted an

extensive area, including a stream, marsh land and surrounding streets". A £5,000 fine was imposed as a result. The three other incidents reported by Diageo were "an oil spill onto the foreshore at Burghead, Scotland, a spillage of propionic acid at Diageo's distillery at Cameronbridge, Scotland and a spill of caustic soda into the Camac River from its Baileys site in Dublin. Diageo stated that: "In each case, action has been taken to prevent recurrence of the incident, none of which resulted in a fine." (ref: 16)

### **Habitats & Resources**

#### **Peat extraction in Scotland (May 2005)**

The May 2005 Corporate Watch UK report, "Bringing the G8 home: Corporate Involvement in and around the G8 2005 in Scotland", stated that Diageo owned two active peat extraction sites in SW Islay which were used to supply the whisky industry on the island. According to the report, both sites were listed as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and one was a Special Area for Conservation (SAC). (ref: 17)

### **Animals**

#### **Animal Testing**

##### **Guinness brands tested on animals (December 2003)**

Arcnews reported in December 2003 that the Guinness brand had been involved in tests on animals to discover whether the product had any health benefits. The experiments were said to have taken place at the University of Wisconsin and involved dogs. Guinness is a subsidiary of Diageo plc. (ref: 18)

### **People**

#### **Human Rights**

##### **Criticism for Thai bar ads (May 2005)**

According to the Scottish Sunday Mail newspaper, viewed online by ECRA in May 2005, Diageo had been criticised for the use of its Johnnie Walker brand whisky in advertisements for brothels and sex bars in Thailand. The Sunday Mail reported that the owners of these premises used the popularity of certain whisky brands with their customers to sell the bars by featuring logos and brand names in billboards and other adverts. Campaigners against the use of children in the Thai sex industry also claimed that many of the bars used prostitutes under the age of 16. Diageo was said to have claimed that once it sold its products to the bars it had no control over how they were used. (ref: 19)

##### **Operations in six oppressive regimes (August 2007)**

When Diageo's corporate website was viewed by ECRA on 23 August 2007 ([www.diageo.com](http://www.diageo.com)), the company had operations in the following countries which were deemed by ECRA to be governed by oppressive regimes at the time of writing: Cameroon; China; the Philippines; Russia; Thailand; and the USA. (ref: 20)

(See also 'Factory pollution in Cameroon' in Pollution & Toxics above.)

#### **Workers' Rights**

##### **Casualisation of operations (2005)**

According to the June 2005 issue of Corporate Watch, in February 2005 Guinness Nigeria had fired 500 workers. Unions were said to have claimed that the company's aim in doing so was to replace the workers with casual employees who cost less in pay and benefits, and that major redundancies in 1992, 1995 and 1997 had all been followed by replacement of the sacked workers with casual labour. Nigeria was on ECRA's list of oppressive regimes at the time of writing. (ref: 21)

##### **Non-unionised workplaces (2004)**

According to the June 2005 issue of Corporate Watch, in July 2004 Diageo had announced that it was cutting 60 jobs in Glasgow and Edinburgh. When asked why the company had not consulted with staff over the move, a spokesperson had stated that it "operated in a non-unionised environment." (ref: 21)

## **Supply Chain Policy**

### **Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (August 2007)**

Diageo's website ([www.diageo.com](http://www.diageo.com)) contained a policy document dated May 2004 titled 'Partnering with Suppliers' when it was viewed by ECRA in August 2007. It contained adequate provisions for suppliers on forced labour, freedom of association and discrimination, elimination of child labour under the age of 15, but unsatisfactory ones on payment of a living wage and limiting the working week to 48 hours and 12 hours overtime. The supply chain policy was independently monitored. Consequently, ECRA gave Diageo its middle rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 22)

## **Irresponsible Marketing**

### **Youth marketing of alcohol (2004)**

According to the report "Clicking with Kids: alcohol marketing and youth on the internet" by the Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth at Georgetown University, Diageo's Smirnoff, Crown Royal, Captain Morgan and Jose Cuervo were amongst a number of alcohol brands which had websites designed in a way which would appeal to underage drinkers. Smirnoff and Jose Cuervo's US sites were said to include such youth-friendly elements as: interactive games such as racing challenge, the ability to send items to friends, high levels of animation, video clips, music downloads, cartoon characters and screensavers and wallpapers described as 'turning the user's PC into a billboard for the product.' The Captain Morgan website was also said to include online video games, music downloads and party plans. Although many sites were said to have a 'card' entrance which asked the user to declare their age, this was said to be ineffective as there was no way of verifying the answers. In the six months to December 2003, the report stated that 33% of the visitors to the smirnoff.com website admitted to being under 21, 8% of visitors to smirnoffice.com, and over 21% of visitors to cuervo.com. (ref: 3)

(See also 'Criticism for Thai bar ads' in Human Rights above.)

## **Politics**

### **Genetic Engineering**

#### **GMO policy (August 2005)**

Diageo's Corporate Social Responsibility Report (2005) included a statement on the company's view of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). It read: "The biotechnology used to create genetically modified organisms, while widely accepted in some parts of the world, is a cause for public concern in others... Until scientific research reveals more about these possible impacts, our policy is to avoid using GM ingredients to make our brands except where local sources of raw materials make this impracticable." However, ECRA viewed this as not being an explicit group-level GMO-free policy and permitted the use of GMOs where using local alternatives was deemed to be "impracticable". (ref: 23)

### **Political Activities**

#### **Membership of ICC lobby group (2007)**

The website of the International Chamber of Commerce ([www.iccwbo.org](http://www.iccwbo.org)), viewed on 16th May 2007, listed Diageo as a member. According to the ICC, it had "direct access to national governments all over the world through its national committees"; "speaks for world business when governments take up such issues as intellectual property rights, transport policy, trade law or the environment"; "At UN summits on sustainable development, financing for development and the information society, ICC spearheads the business contribution." ECRA noted that the activity of lobby groups such as the ICC often meant that business interests were protected at the expense of the environmental and human rights. (ref: 24)

#### **Lower middle rating for information provision on lobbying (2005)**

The 2005 SustainAbility/WWF report 'Influencing Power:

Reviewing the conduct and content of corporate lobbying', ranked how 100 major companies reported on lobbying and its relationship to their core business, from the provision of no information through to 'basic' (82 companies), 'developing' (10 companies), 'systematic' (8 companies) or 'integrated' reporting (0 companies). It said that Diageo was one of those whose reports had been placed in the 'developing' category. (ref: 25)

## **Anti-Social Finance**

### **Operations in eleven tax havens (August 2007)**

According to the Diageo corporate website [www.diageo.com](http://www.diageo.com), viewed by ECRA in August 2007, the company had operations in the following countries regarded by ECRA at the time of writing as tax havens: Cyprus; Ireland; Malta; Switzerland; Hong Kong; Malaysia; Mauritius; the Philippines; the Seychelles; and Singapore. (ref: 20)

### **Director's pay 2006 (2006)**

According to the August 2006 issue of Labour Research, a director of Diageo was paid a total of £3.13 million in pay and benefits for the financial year 2005/6. ECRA considered annual pay of more than £1 million to be excessive. (ref: 26)

### **Directors pay 2004-5 (2005)**

According to the September 2005 issue of Labour Research, in the financial year 2004/5 a director of Diageo had been paid over £2.1 million. (ref: 27)

## **Fortune Brands**

*520 Lake Cook Road, Deerfield, Illinois, 60015, USA*

## **Environment**

### **Environmental Reporting (August 2007)**

#### **Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (August 2007)**

A search was made by ECRA in August 2007 on the company website [www.fortunebrands.com](http://www.fortunebrands.com) for a copy of the Fortune Brands environmental policy or report. This revealed a one-page "Statement of Environmental Stewardship" dated January 2005, which included a range of promises on environmental practice and development, but which featured no firm targets or commitments and made no mention of independent monitoring or verification. Consequently, ECRA gave Fortune Brands its worst rating in this category. (ref: 28)

## **Animals**

### **Other Animal Rights**

#### **Leather products (September 2007)**

A search of the website [www.scottycameron.com](http://www.scottycameron.com), a brand of Fortune Brands' subsidiary Acushnet Company, on 10 October 2007, showed that the company sold golfing accessories made of leather. (ref: 29)

## **People**

### **Human Rights**

#### **Operations in two oppressive regimes (August 2007)**

A search was made of the website of Titleist ([www.titleist.com/corporate/contact.asp](http://www.titleist.com/corporate/contact.asp)), a brand of Fortune Brand subsidiary Acushnet Company, on 10 October 2007. According to the website the company had operations in China and Thailand, both of which were deemed to be governed by oppressive regimes by ECRA at the time of writing. (ref: 30)

#### **Operations in six oppressive regimes (September 2007)**

According to the Maxxium website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.maxxium.com](http://www.maxxium.com)), the company had operations in the following countries which, at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be governed by an oppressive regime:

China; Indonesia; the Philippines; Russia; Thailand; and Vietnam. According to Maxxium's website, viewed October 2007, it was 25% owned by Beam Global Spirits & Wine, a subsidiary of Fortune Brands. (ref: 31)

## **Workers' Rights**

### **Mexican maquila operations (2002)**

According to the 2003 report "Maquiladora/Manufacturing in Mexico's Border Region" by two US and Canadian business thinktanks, in 2002 Master Lock Company LLC was one of the companies operating major Maquila factories in the Sonora region of Northern Mexico. Maquila factories had been widely criticised by Mexican and international labour rights organisations for often having low standards of worker safety, for denying workers the right to unionise, for paying low wages and often for subjecting female workers to degrading health checks. According to Hoovers Online (www.hoovers.com), viewed October 2007, Master Lock Company LLC was a wholly owned subsidiary of Fortune Brands. (ref: 32)

### **Degrading treatment of workers (2002)**

According to the Autumn 2002 issue of Hazards, trade union pressure had had to be exerted at a Jim Beam plant in America to reverse company policy of limiting toilet breaks for workers. It was reported that some workers had been forced to wet themselves or face disciplinary action. Jim Beam was a brand of Fortune Brands' subsidiary Beam Global Spirits & Wine, Inc. (ref: 33)

## **Supply Chain Policy**

### **Middle ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (August 2007)**

A search was made by ECRA in August 2007 on the Fortune Brands website for the company's supply chain policy (www.fortunebrands.com). A document titled "Fortune Brands Global Citizenship Policy" dated January 2005 was found to include commitments to the elimination of child labour under 15 years old, the freedom of association, and prohibition of discrimination and forced labour. However, as this policy made no commitment to the payment of a living wage, did not limit the working week to 48 hours and 12 hours overtime, and was not independently monitored, ECRA gave Fortune Brands its middle rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 34)

## **Irresponsible Marketing**

### **Youth marketing of alcohol (2004)**

According to the report "Clicking with Kids: alcohol marketing and youth on the internet" by the Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth at Georgetown University, Jim Beam and DeKuyper were amongst a number of alcohol brands which had websites designed in a way which would appeal to underage drinkers. Jim Beam and DeKuyper's US sites were said to include such youth-friendly elements as: interactive colour and image elements on the website, music concert details, motor racing information and screensavers and wallpapers described as 'turning the user's PC into a billboard for the product.' Although many sites were said to have a 'card' entrance which asked the user to declare their age, this was said to be ineffective as there was no way of verifying the answers. In the six months to December 2003, the report stated that over 20% of the visitors to the www.jimbeam.com website admitted to being under 21. (ref: 3)

## **Armaments**

### **Provision of military supplies (2006)**

According to the Fortune Brands Inc Annual Report 2006, its subsidiary, Master Lock Company LLC, supplied padlocks to the US military. (ref: 35)

## **Politics**

### **Genetic Engineering**

#### **Lack of an explicit GM-free policy (January 2005)**

When Fortune Brands' website was viewed by ECRA in September 2007, it included a 'Statement of Environmental Stewardship' dated January 2005. Although it referred to the company's use of '[c]ontrol methods, procedures and processes that [were] technically sound and economically feasible...to reduce environmental impacts', no explicit GMO-free policy was found. (ref: 28)

### **Anti-Social Finance**

#### **Subsidiaries in tax havens (August 2007)**

According to Fortune Brands' corporate website viewed by ECRA in August 2007 (www.fortunebrands.com), the company had subsidiaries in countries which were identified by ECRA at the time of writing to be tax havens: Hong Kong; Ireland; Macao; the Philippines; Singapore and Uruguay. (ref: 30)

#### **Subsidies in tax havens (September 2007)**

According to the Maxxium website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 (www.maxxium.com), the company had operations in the following countries which, at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be tax havens: Hong Kong; Ireland; Luxembourg; Malaysia; the Philippines; and Singapore. According to Maxxium's website, viewed October 2007, it was 25% owned by Beam Global Spirits & Wine, a subsidiary of Fortune Brands. (ref: 31)

## **Groupe Arnault SAS**

*41 Ave. Montaigne, 75008 Paris, France*

*According to Hoovers Online (www.hoovers.com), viewed 10 October 2007, Groupe Arnault SAS (owned by Chairman and CEO Bernard Arnault and family) controlled Christian Dior with a 72% stake and held nearly a 50% stake in LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA (LVMH). Hoovers Online also stated that Christian Dior SA held a 42% controlling stake in LVMH.*

## **LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA (subsidiary)**

*22, avenue Montaigne, Paris, 75008, France*

## **Environment**

### **Environmental Reporting**

#### **Best ECRA rating for environmental reporting (2006)**

LVMH's Environment Report 2006 demonstrated a reasonable understanding of the company's impact on the environment and contained quantified future targets for environmental impact reduction. The report was also independently verified by Ernst & Young. It was therefore awarded ECRA best rating. (ref: 42)

## **Christian Dior SA (subsidiary)**

*33, Avenue Hoche, Paris, 75008, France*

## **Politics**

### **Anti-Social Finance**

#### **Subsidiaries in tax havens (2004)**

Christian Dior's Annual Report 2004 listed subsidiaries in the following countries considered to be tax havens by ECRA at the time of the report; Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Hong Kong, Luxembourg, Ireland, Monaco and Singapore. (ref: 12)

#### **Excessive directors' remuneration (2003)**

Christian Dior's Annual Report 2004 stated that two directors received payments in excess of one million during the previous financial year. Bernald Arnault received Euros 1,930,487 (equivalent to £1,324,054) and Pierre Gode received Euros 2,367,774 (equivalent to £1,622,963). ECRA considered directors

pay in excess of £1 million per annum to be excessive. (ref: 12)

## **Pollution & Toxics**

### **Manufacture of perfumes found to contain toxic chemicals (February 2007)**

The Greenpeace Chemical Home website at [www.greenpeace.org.uk](http://www.greenpeace.org.uk) was viewed by ECRA on 6 September 2007. The website contained a report titled 'Cleaning Up Our Chemical Homes' (February 2007) which reviewed the progress companies had made on removing harmful chemicals from products found in the home during Greenpeace's campaign on this issue. Dior Poison and Pure Poison perfumes were listed as products that manufacturers had told Greenpeace contained harmful chemicals, or as products that were manufactured or retailed by a company who had not replied or who had refused to supply the information that Greenpeace had asked for, and as a result Greenpeace had assumed the products contained harmful chemical pollutants. (ref: 43)

### **Manufacture of fragrance found to contain toxic chemicals (September 2005)**

The Greenpeace Chemical Home website at [www.greenpeace.org.uk](http://www.greenpeace.org.uk) was viewed by ECRA on 7 September 2005, the website listed perfumes which did and did not contain harmful chemical pollutants. Guerlain and Givenchy perfumes, made by subsidiaries of LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA, were listed as products that manufacturers had told Greenpeace contained harmful chemicals, or as a product that was manufactured or retailed by a company who had not replied or who had refused to supply the information that Greenpeace had asked for, and as a result Greenpeace had assumed the product contained harmful chemical pollutants. (ref: 44)

### **Manufacture of product found to contain toxic chemicals (September 2005)**

## **Animals**

### **Animal Testing**

#### **Animal testing policy not endorsed by Naturewatch (2007)**

Naturewatch's Compassionate Shopping Guide 10th edition 2007 listed Guerlain as a company that did not have a fixed cut off date for its animal testing policy and was subsequently not endorsed by Naturewatch. (ref: 45)

#### **Animal testing policy not endorsed by Naturewatch (2005)**

Naturewatch's Compassionate Shopping Guide 10th edition 2005 listed BeneFit Cosmetics LLC, a subsidiary of LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA, as a company that did not have a fixed cut off date for its animal testing policy and was subsequently not endorsed by Naturewatch. (ref: 45)

#### **Animal testing policy not endorsed by Naturewatch (2005)**

Naturewatch's Compassionate Shopping Guide 10th edition 2005 listed Givenchy as a company that did not have a fixed cut off date for its animal testing policy and was subsequently not endorsed by Naturewatch. (ref: 45)

### **Other Animal Rights**

#### **Production, supply and retail of fur products (August 2005)**

The International Fur Trade Federation website [www.fur-style.com](http://www.fur-style.com) viewed by ECRA on 24 August 2005 listed Celine, Donna Karan International and Marc Jacobs Inc, subsidiaries of LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA, as a companies that used animal fur in their fashion collection. (ref: 46)

## **People**

### **Human Rights**

#### **Operations in ten oppressive regimes (August 2007)**

According to its website, [www.lvmh.com](http://www.lvmh.com), viewed by ECRA on 22 August 2007, LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA had operations in the following countries deemed by ECRA at the

time of writing to be governed by oppressive regimes: China; Indonesia; Kuwait; Lebanon; Philippines; Russia; Saudi Arabia; Thailand; United Arab Emirates; and Vietnam. (ref: 47)

#### **Violence against Filipino strikers at supplier factory(2007)**

According to issue 23 of the Clean Clothes Campaign (CCC) newsletter (May 2007), in January 2006, during strikes at a Korean-owned garment factory in the Filipino Cavite Export Processing which was producing for six US companies including DKNY, strikers had on several occasions reportedly been hit on the head with clubs and kicked. The article also stated that the lawfully elected union had met refusal by managers to start negotiations, and that the union had been demonstrating daily since July 2006. It said that in March 2007 they had renewed their protest actions by increasing numbers on the picket lines. It said that the striking workers wanted to highlight the role played by the Philippine Economic Zone Authority and the Department of Labor and Employment in turning a blind eye to the continuing atrocities and gross violations of labour rights against them. (ref: 48)

#### **Garments manufactured in oppressive regime (2005)**

According to the company website [lucky.com.hk](http://lucky.com.hk), viewed by ECRA in October 2005, Lucky Enterprising was a Hong Kong garment manufacturer which produced a range of clothes for export in both Hong Kong and China. The company's website did not appear to include any code of conduct for workers' rights in its factories. The company claimed to manufacture clothes for a range of international customers, including DKNY, Debenhams, Tabi Japan and Lands End. (ref: 49)

## **Workers' Rights**

#### **Poor auditing in Romanian factory (2005)**

According to a 2005 report by the Clean Clothes Campaign, "Looking for a quick fix: How weak social auditing is keeping workers in sweatshops," auditing of factories in Romania producing items for Kenzo had failed to pick up labour issues. This was partly attributed to the practice of auditors interviewing workers with management present, hindering open comment. Workers were quoted as saying that although they were not threatened or dismissed if they refused overtime, their names were put on a 'black list.' This resulted in them being given lower paid jobs, being most vulnerable during restructuring and receiving criticism and 'cold' treatment from supervisors. (ref: 50)

#### **Poor auditing in Romanian factory (2005)**

According to a 2005 report by the Clean Clothes Campaign, "Looking for a quick fix: How weak social auditing is keeping workers in sweatshops," auditing of a factory in Romania producing items for Givenchy had failed to pick up labour issues. This was partly attributed to the practice of auditors interviewing workers with management present, hindering open comment. Workers were quoted as saying that although they were not threatened or dismissed if they refused overtime, their names were put on a 'black list.' This resulted in them being given lower paid jobs, being most vulnerable during restructuring and receiving criticism and 'cold' treatment from supervisors. (ref: 50)

#### **Workers' rights abuse court case settled in Saipan (March 2004)**

According to the March 2004 edition of Labour Behind the Label, a settlement was arrived at in the case of three Saipan lawsuits instigated five years ago by US NGOs and garment workers. It reported that garment workers in factories producing for Donna Karan amongst others, were denied the right to trade union activity, attend religious services and worked over 48 hours per week for a low wage with unpaid overtime. The Saipan case had been an important testing ground for activists' new legal strategies, according to the report. (ref: 51)

## **Supply Chain Policy**

#### **Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (2006)**

LVMH's Annual Report 2006 stated that it markets a high percentage of "made in France" products, with most of its production in France and most subcontractors located in France or Italy. It stated this "facilitated LVMH's compliance with the provision of the fundamental conventions of the International Labor Organisation". The report also stated that several group companies had established charters and codes of conduct. "Audits are conducted with suppliers, particularly in countries that are just beginning to be sensitive to the standards set by the ILO. Additional information is available in the 2006 LVMH reference document". The Annual report did not give specific details of the company's supply chain policy and the LVMH reference document was not found on the company's website. The company was therefore awarded ECR's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 52)

### **Irresponsible Marketing**

(See also 'Manufacture of perfumes found to contain toxic chemicals' in Pollution & Toxics above.)

(See also 'Manufacture of fragrance found to contain toxic chemicals' in Pollution & Toxics above.)

(See also 'Manufacture of product found to contain toxic chemicals' in Pollution & Toxics above.)

## **Politics**

### **Genetic Engineering**

#### **No policy addressing GM cotton in clothing products (May 2006)**

ECRA was unable to locate a GM-free policy on DKNY's website (www.dkny.com) during a search on the 4th May 2006. As the company was involved in the use of cotton in its clothing, which has been criticised by environmental campaigners for high levels of contamination by GM material, ECRA awarded it a negative mark. (ref: 53)

### **Boycott Call**

#### **Boycott call by National Mobilization Against Sweatshops (September 2007)**

The National Mobilization Against Sweatshops (NMASS) website (www.nmass.org) was viewed by ECRA in September 2007, the website stated that the boycott of Donna Karan and DKNY was still ongoing. The boycott had been called by NMASS due to conditions in a factory in New York producing clothes for DKNY. Employees worked 10 hours a day 6 days a week with a 40 minute break at midday. Workers were not allowed to use the bathroom unless they had finished their quotas and they were not allowed to look up or speak to each other. Even in the case of family medical emergencies employees were not allowed to make or receive phone calls. Workers received no paid vacation or sick leave and women were reportedly unable to take maternity leave without jeopardising their jobs. Latina workers were paid less than Chinese workers for the same tasks in order to pit the two groups against each other. When employees spoke out against the conditions they lost their jobs. NMASS reported that Donna Karan and DKNY denied responsibility. (ref: 54)

#### **Boycott call by National Mobilization Against Sweatshops (August 2005)**

The National Mobilization Against Sweatshops (NMASS) website www.nmass.org was viewed by ECRA on 24 August 2005, the website stated that the boycott of Donna Karan and DKNY was still ongoing. The boycott had been called by NMASS due to conditions in a factory in New York producing clothes for DKNY. Employees worked 10 hours a day 6 days a week with a 40 minute break at midday. Workers were not allowed to use the bathroom unless they had finished their quotas and they were not allowed to look up or speak to each other. Even in the case of family medical emergencies employees were not allowed to make or receive phone calls. Workers received no paid vacation or sick leave and women were reportedly unable to take maternity leave

without jeopardising their jobs. Latina workers were paid less than Chinese workers for the same tasks in order to pit the two groups against each other. When employees spoke out against the conditions they lost their jobs. NMASS reported that Ms Karan and DKNY denied responsibility. (ref: 55)

#### **Boycott call by BIG campaign (August 2005)**

According to the Palestine Solidarity Campaign's Boycott Israeli Goods website www.bigcampaign.org viewed by ECRA on 24 August 2005, Donna Karan was said to source products from Delta Galil. Delta Galil was said to be an Israeli clothing manufacturer which produced large amounts of products, such as underwear, baby clothes, and leisure wear, to UK and US companies. The organisation was calling for a boycott of all such goods as a protest against human rights abuses carried out by the Israeli state in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. (ref: 56)

### **Anti-Social Finance**

#### **Operations in eight tax havens (August 2007)**

According to the LVMH Worldwide section of the company's website viewed by ECRA on 22 August 2007 (www.lvmh.com), LVMH had operations in the following countries which, at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be tax havens: Bermuda; Hong Kong; Ireland; Luxembourg; Malaysia; Monaco; Philippines; and Uruguay. (ref: 47)

## **London & Scottish International**

*Meadowview House, Tannery Lane, Bramley, Surrey, GU5 0AB*

## **Environment**

### **Environmental Reporting**

#### **Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (May 2006)**

ECRA received a document titled 'London & Scottish Environmental Policy' in August 2007, dated May 2006. It mentioned that "over the next year the [company] would estimate the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> generated by [its] day to day use of the office" in order to make itself "carbon neutral". It also stated that it would make company flights "carbon neutral" through carbon offsetting and plant trees to offset CO<sub>2</sub> emitted by car use. While the policy did acknowledge the company's overall impact on the environment in terms of the resources it used to package and distribute its goods, quantified and dated future targets (required by ECRA to obtain best rating) were not included. Although London & Scottish was a small to medium enterprise with a turnover of less than £5 million, not all of the company's products were a social or environmental alternative. Therefore the company did not receive the exclusion in the category for smaller companies providing environmental or ethical alternatives. Consequently, ECRA gave London & Scottish International its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 36)

## **People**

### **Supply Chain Policy**

#### **Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (August 2007)**

ECRA contacted London & Scottish International in August 2007 to request details of its supply chain policy or one that addressed workers' rights within its supply chain. A document titled 'London & Scottish Environmental Policy' dated May 2006 was sent to ECRA, but no reference was made to the company's supply chain apart from its objective to "...question and encourage [its] suppliers to become more environmentally aware". Although the company did produce a brand of rum that was certified Fairtrade, in its response to ECRA London & Scottish International did not provide any other information about its supply chain. Consequently, ECRA gave the company its worst rating in this category. (ref: 37)

## Politics

### Company Ethos

#### All products certified organic (25 September 2007)

According to a telephone call (25 September 2007) with a representative of the Organic Spirit Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of London & Scottish International, all of the companies products were certified organic. (ref: 80)

## Product sustainability

### Organic product

#### Organic product (September 2007)

Highland Harvest organic blended whisky was certified organic by the Soil Association, according to the website of Vinceremos (an organic drinks' specialist), viewed in September 2007. (ref: 38)

#### Organic product (August 2007)

According to the company website [www.junipergreen.org](http://www.junipergreen.org), viewed by ECRA in August 2007, Juniper Green gin was a certified organic product. (ref: 39)

#### Organic product (September 2007)

According to the website of the organic drinks' specialist Vinceremos, viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.vinceremos.co.uk](http://www.vinceremos.co.uk)), Papagayo spiced rum was a certified organic product. (ref: 38)

#### Organic product (September 2007)

According to the website of the organic drinks' specialist Vinceremos, viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.vinceremos.co.uk](http://www.vinceremos.co.uk)), Papagayo white rum was a certified organic product. (ref: 38)

#### Organic product (September 2007)

According to the company website [www.uk5.org](http://www.uk5.org) viewed by ECRA in September 2007, UK5 gin was a certified organic product. (ref: 40)

#### Certified organic product (August 2007)

A shop survey conducted by ECRA in August 2007 found that Utkins Fairtrade white rum was certified organic by the UK's Soil Association. (ref: 41)

### Fairtrade Product

#### Fairtrade product (August 2007)

A shop survey conducted by ECRA in Manchester in August 2007, found Utkins Fair Trade white rum was a Fairtrade Foundation certified product. (ref: 41)

## Pernod-Ricard SA

*12, Place des Etats-Unis, 75783, Cedex-16, Paris, France*

## Environment

### Environmental Reporting

#### Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (July 2006)

Environmental information about Pernod Ricard was found in its 2005/2006 Annual Report viewed on its website by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.pernod-ricard.com](http://www.pernod-ricard.com)). This section of the report included achievements in reducing the company's waste in relation to, for example, energy use and carbon emissions. It also showed a reasonable understanding of Pernod's main environmental impacts such as its use of water, raw materials and overall energy. However, this section of the annual report did not include at least two dated and quantified future targets, and there was no mention of independent monitoring or verification, required by ECRA to achieve a best rating. ECRA gave Pernod its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 57)

## People

### Human Rights

#### Criticism for Thai bar ads (May 2005)

According to the Scottish Sunday Mail newspaper, viewed online by ECRA in May 2005, Chivas had been criticised for the use of its Chivas Regal brand whisky in advertisements for brothels and sex bars in Thailand. The Sunday Mail reported that the owners of these premises used the popularity of certain whisky brands with their customers to sell the bars by featuring logos and brand names in billboards and other adverts. Campaigners against the use of children in the Thai sex industry also claimed that many of the bars used prostitutes under the age of 16. Chivas was said to have claimed that it simply gave point-of-sale material to stockists of its products and that this may have led to 'confusion.' (ref: 19)

#### Operations in seven oppressive regimes (September 2007)

According to the company website [www.pernod-ricard.com](http://www.pernod-ricard.com), viewed by ECRA in September 2007, Pernod Ricard had operations in the following countries regarded by ECRA at the time of writing as being governed by oppressive regimes: China; Kazakhstan; the Philippines; Russia; Thailand; United Arab Emirates; and the USA. (ref: 58)

### Supply Chain Policy

#### Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (July 2006)

Within Pernod's annual report of 2005/2006 was a section titled 'Environmental and Social Responsibility'. It included a subsection titled 'Sharing our ethics'. Pernod reported that at the time of writing it had sent questionnaires named 'Commitment and Sustainable Development' to 20 of its principal international suppliers. From the responses the company received, it would evaluate its suppliers' environmental and social performance. Furthermore, the company's website [www.pernod-ricard.com](http://www.pernod-ricard.com) viewed by ECRA on 11 July 2007, stated that in 2006 16 of the company's suppliers which returned a completed questionnaire made commitments to comply with ethical codes related to labour laws.

The 'Sharing our ethics' section of Pernod's annual report also stated that the company applied the ten principles of the United Nations 'Global Compact' to its supply chain. The Compact addressed issues relating to human rights, labour standards, the environment and corruption in relation to company practices. However, as the company made no specific commitment to the elimination of child labour under 15 years old, the provision of a living wage, or limitations on hours in a working week (48 hours and 12 overtime), and as its monitoring of supplier ethics was not independently verified, ECRA gave Pernod its worst rating in this category. (ref: 59)

### Irresponsible Marketing

#### Youth marketing of alcohol (2004)

According to the 2004 Georgetown University Alcohol Study Centre report 'Clicking with Kids: alcohol marketing and youth on the internet,' Pernod Ricard's Seagram Gin and Two Dogs websites was amongst those of a number of alcohol brands which were criticised for marketing their products in a way which appealed to underage drinkers. Although most such websites did ask viewers to verify their date of birth, it was pointed out by the report that there was no way of checking the data given. Features of these websites which were said to appeal to younger viewers included: interactive games, screensavers and wallpapers described as 'turning the user's PC into a billboard,' music information, pictures of scantily clad models on calendar and email updates sign-up pages, cartoon characters. (ref: 3)

(See also 'Criticism for Thai bar ads' in Human Rights above.)

## Politics

### Genetic Engineering

#### Lack of an explicit GMO-free policy (September 2007)

When Pernod Ricard's website was viewed by ECRA in September 2007, it included a page titled 'Environment'. Although it referred to the company's use of "sustainable agriculture" and the maintenance of biodiversity in the production of its products, no explicit GMO-free policy was found. (ref: 60)

### Political Activities

#### Membership of free trade lobby group (25 May 2007)

According to the website of the National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC), [www.nftc.org](http://www.nftc.org), visited on 8th June 2007, Pernod-Ricard was 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 organisation. (ref: 61)

### Anti-Social Finance

#### Subsidiaries in four tax havens (September 2007)

According to the company website [www.pernod-ricard.com](http://www.pernod-ricard.com), viewed by ECRA in September 2007, Pernod-Ricard had operations in the following countries regarded by ECRA at the time of writing as tax havens: Ireland; the Phillipines; Singapore; and Uruguay. (ref: 58)

## Robertson Trust (controller of the Edrington Group)

According to Hoovers Online ([www.hoovers.com](http://www.hoovers.com)), viewed 10 October 2007, the Robertson Trust, a Scottish charity, controls the Edrington Group. The Robertson Trust was established by the Robertson sisters in 1961, when they donated the shares in the Group founded by their grandfather, William Robertson to the Trust for charitable purposes.

*85 Berkeley Street, Glasgow, Lanarkshire, G3 7DX, Scotland*

## The Edrington Group)

*2500 Great Western Rd., Glasgow, G15 6RW*

## Environment

### Environmental Reporting

#### Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (August 2007)

When the Edrington Group's website was viewed by ECRA in August 2007, it included a brief environmental policy. The policy stated that the company would "meet and exceed [its] legal requirements, prevent pollution by [its] activities and strive to continually improve [its] system and procedures". It also aimed to "reduce energy consumption at [the company's] Great Western Road headquarters by over 10 per cent in the coming year". However, as the policy did not include at least two dated and quantified future targets, did not show a reasonable understanding of the company's main environmental impacts, and did not specify that its objectives would be independently audited, ECRA gave Edrington its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 68)

## People

### Human Rights

#### Operations in six oppressive regimes (September 2007)

According to the Maxxium website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.maxxium.com](http://www.maxxium.com)), the company had operations in the following countries which, at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be governed by an oppressive regime: China; Indonesia; the Philippines; Russia; Thailand; and Vietnam. According to the Maxxium website it was 25% owned by the Edrington Group. (ref: 31)

### Supply Chain Policy

#### Best ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (August 2007)

The Edrington Group received a top rating from Ethical Consumer in August 2007 for its supply chain policy because according to its website ([www.edringtongroup.com](http://www.edringtongroup.com)), viewed by ECRA in August 2007, all of its brands were drinks produced in the European Union (EU), where labour standards were relatively high and labour rights issues less of a concern to campaigners. A shop survey in Manchester during August 2007, confirmed that Edrington brands looked at had been made in the EU. (ref: 69)

## UB Group (United Breweries)

38% of the company is owned by Scottish & Newcastle plc (see below).

*The UB Group, UB Anchorage, 5th Floor, 100/1, Richmond Road, Bangalore, 560 025, India.*

## Environment

### Environmental Reporting

#### Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (September 2007)

Whyte and Mackay did not respond to a request for a copy of its environmental report made by ECRA in September 2007. No evidence of such a report was found on its website ([www.whyteandmackay.com](http://www.whyteandmackay.com)). Consequently, ECRA gave the company its worst rating for environmental reporting. Viewed in September 2007, Hoovers Online ([www.hoovers.com](http://www.hoovers.com)) stated that in 2007 the company was sold to United Spirits Limited (a subsidiary of the UB Group). (ref: 70)

#### Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (September 2007)

The UB Group did not respond to a request for a copy of its environmental report made by ECRA in September 2007. No evidence of such a report was found on its website when viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.theubgroup.com](http://www.theubgroup.com)). Consequently, ECRA gave the company its worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 81)

## Animals

### Other Animal Rights

#### Sale of leather goods (April 2007)

According to the April-June issue of the United Breweries Group E-magazine viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.theubgroup.com/housemagazine.html](http://www.theubgroup.com/housemagazine.html)), the company's subsidiary, UB Global, sold leather goods including leather boots. (ref: 71)

## People

### Human Rights

#### Operations in three oppressive regimes (January 2007)

According to the January-March 2007 issue of Pegasus, the in-house E-magazine of the United Breweries Group viewed by ECRA in September 2007 (<http://www.theubgroup.com/Pegasus-jan-mar2007/index.html>), the Group had operations in China, UAE and the US. Furthermore, the April-June issue of the magazine

stated that the company's subsidiary, Kingfisher, had operations in Pakistan. At the time of writing, all four countries were deemed by ECRA to be governed by oppressive regimes. (ref: 72)

## **Supply Chain Policy**

### **Worst ECRA rating for Supply Chain Policy (September 2007)**

The UB Group did not respond to a request for a copy of its supply chain policy made by ECRA in September 2007. No evidence of such a policy, or any which addressed workers' rights along the company's supply chain was found on its website when viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.theubgroup.com](http://www.theubgroup.com)). Consequently, ECRA gave the company its worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 73)

## **Politics**

### **Genetic Engineering**

#### **No explicit GM-free policy (September 2007)**

When ECRA searched the United Breweries Group website in September 2007 ([www.theubgroup.com/](http://www.theubgroup.com/)), it did not include an explicit GM-free cotton policy. As the Group had a subsidiary which operated in the global apparel industry, ECRA considered the lack of a GM-free cotton policy to be an unethical aspect of the Group's operations. (ref: 71)

### **Anti-Social Finance**

#### **Operations in one tax haven (January 2007)**

According to the January-March 2007 issue of Pegasus, the in-house E-magazine of the United Breweries Group viewed by ECRA in September 2007 (<http://www.theubgroup.com/Pegasus-jan-mar2007/index.html>), the Group had operations in Panama. At the time of writing, ECRA considered this country to be a tax haven. (ref: 74)

## **Scottish & Newcastle plc (owns 38% of the UB Group)**

*Abbey Brewery, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8 8YS*

## **Animals**

### **Other Animal Rights**

#### **Products not suitable for vegetarians (2006)**

According to an email from the Vegetarian Society dated 5th May 2006, Foster's, John Smith's, Kronenbourg and Newcastle Brown Ale were not suitable for vegetarians. This was because they were fined (cleared) using isinglass. Isinglass comes from the swim bladders of fish. (ref: 63)

#### **Supporting animal abuse through advertising (2006)**

John Smith's website ([www.johnsmiths.co.uk](http://www.johnsmiths.co.uk)) said that 2006 was its second year as sponsor of the Grand National. The event has been criticised by animal rights group Animal Aid who claim that the event is designed to push horses beyond their limits, and many die during the race and after. Since 1997 the race has claimed the lives of 30 horses. There are also rumours that horses that do not make the grade are killed. Racing horses are stabled for 20 hours a day, which makes them frustrated and anxious. (ref: 64)

## **People**

### **Human Rights**

#### **Operations in four oppressive regimes (2005)**

Scottish & Newcastle's Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2005 said it operated in China, Kazakhstan, Russia and the United States. All of these countries were on ECRA's list of oppressive regimes at the time of writing. (ref: 65)

## **Politics**

### **Anti-Social Finance**

#### **Allegations of anti-social finance (26 July 2005)**

According to The Guardian newspaper on 26th July 2005, Scottish & Newcastle vigorously contested allegations that it had engaged in 'unlawful trading tactics' via its BBH subsidiary. BBH was designed as a vehicle to buy up Russian interests but various minority shareholders in the Russian breweries it had been targeting had complained the company had used questionable tactics to make its acquisitions. These include the use of the Baltika Brewery to acquire other Russian breweries which had allegedly been overvalued. This allowed money to be siphoned back to the heavily indebted parent companies, S & N and Carlsberg, whilst piling leverage onto Baltika. It was alleged that Hartwell Capital has improperly been granted a vote in Baltika's affairs, despite being controlled by a Scottish & Newcastle director and holding over 10% of Scottish & Newcastle shares. It was claimed that Russian regulators had declared that Hartwell Capital had a conflict of interest and should not have been granted a vote. (ref: 67)

#### **Subsidiary in tax haven (2005)**

Scottish & Newcastle's Annual Report 2005 said it had a subsidiary in Ireland. Ireland was on ECRA's list of tax havens at the time of writing. (ref: 66)

## **V&S Group**

*Årstaängsvägen 19a, Stockholm, 117 97, Sweden*

## **Environment**

### **Environmental Reporting**

#### **Best ECRA rating for Environmental Reporting (February 2007)**

The V&S Group's Annual Report 2006 published in February 2007 included a section titled 'Targeting reduced impact on climate change'. It contained quantified and dated future targets on energy and water efficiency, along with recycling, and the share of eco-friendly packaging used by the Group. This section showed a reasonable understanding of the company's main environmental impacts such as its use of ingredients, raw materials, water, and carbon emissions. Data and information presented in the tables, diagrams and graphs in this section were independently reviewed by Pricewaterhouse Coopers AB, Stockholm. The annual report was available on the company's website when viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.vsgroup.com](http://www.vsgroup.com)). Consequently, ECRA gave the V&S Group its best rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 75)

## **People**

### **Human Rights**

#### **Operations in eight oppressive regimes (September 2007)**

According to the V&S Group's ABSOLUT vodka website ([www.absolut.co.uk](http://www.absolut.co.uk)), viewed by ECRA in September 2007, the company had operations in the following countries: China; Indonesia; Kazakhstan; the Philippines; Russia; Thailand; the US; and Vietnam. At the time of writing these countries were on ECRA's list of countries governed by an oppressive regime. (ref: 76)

#### **Chinese expansion (2005)**

According to a February 2005 press notice on the V&S corporate website [www.vsgroup.com](http://www.vsgroup.com), viewed by ECRA in June 2005, the ABSOLUT division of the company had announced that it was launching a major marketing campaign aimed at expanding sales of its ABSOLUT -brand vodka in China. (ref: 77)

#### **Operations in six oppressive regimes (September 2007)**

According to the Maxxium website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.maxxium.com](http://www.maxxium.com)), the company had operations in

the following countries which, at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be governed by an oppressive regime: China; Indonesia; the Philippines; Russia; Thailand; and Vietnam. According to Maxxium's website, viewed October 2007, it was 25% owned by V&S Group (ref: 31)

## Supply Chain Policy

### ECRA worst rating for Supply Chain Policy (September 2007)

When the V&S Group's corporate website was viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.vsgroup.com](http://www.vsgroup.com)), it contained a page titled 'Workplace' which detailed company objectives that were also included in the Group's 2006 Annual Report. This page outlined the company's approach to supply chain management. Although the page included commitments to employee freedom of association, ridding discrimination in the workplace, and prohibiting the use of forced labour, no specific policy to eliminate the use of child labour under 15 years old was included, neither was a commitment made to paying employees a living wage. Furthermore, as the Group conducted internal audits of its business ethics rather than have them independently monitored, ECRA gave the company its worst rating in this category. (ref: 78)

## Irresponsible Marketing

### Youth marketing of vodka (2004)

According to the report "Clicking with Kids: alcohol marketing and youth on the internet" by the Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth at Georgetown University, ABSOLUT was one a number of alcohol brands which had websites designed in a way which would appeal to underage drinkers. Absolut's sites were said to include such youth-friendly elements as: high levels of animation, music downloads, animated characters on nights out, downloadable screensavers and wallpapers which were said to 'turn the users' PC into a billboard for the product,' drinks quizzes and a Pick-Up Line Generator" based on the personality types 'traditional, sensitive or desperate.' Although many sites were said to have a 'card' entrance which asked the user to declare their age, this was said to be ineffective as there was no way of verifying the answers. In the six months ending December 2003, the report stated that around 10% of the visitors to the Absolut.com website admitted to being underage. (ref: 3)

## Politics

### Anti-Social Finance

#### Subsidiaries in nine tax havens (September 2007)

According to the V&S Group's website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.vsgroup.com](http://www.vsgroup.com)), the company had subsidiaries in countries which were deemed by ECRA to be tax havens at the time of writing: Hong Kong and the US Virgin Islands. Furthermore, according to the V&S Group's ABSOLUT vodka website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.absolut.co.uk](http://www.absolut.co.uk)), the company operated in the following countries which were also deemed by ECRA to be tax havens at the time of writing: Cyprus; Ireland; Malaysia; Malta; the Philippines; Singapore; and Uruguay. (ref: 79)

#### Subsidies in tax havens (September 2007)

According to the Maxxium website viewed by ECRA in September 2007 ([www.maxxium.com](http://www.maxxium.com)), the company had operations in the following countries which, at the time of writing, were considered by ECRA to be tax havens: Hong Kong; Ireland; Luxembourg; Malaysia; the Philippines; and Singapore. (ref: 31)

## References

- 1 - Bacardi & Company Limited Corporate Communications: [www.bacardilimited.com](http://www.bacardilimited.com) (22 August 2007) (509696)
- 2 - "Rum distiller Bacardi must stop polluting Atlantic Ocean" Environment News Service (26 September 2005) (513174)
- 3 - "Polishing the Sniffer, Dusting Off the Ears" New York Times, 29 September 2002 (513199)
- 4 - Hoovers 2007 [www.hoovers.com:Shanghai Bacardi Co, Ltd factsheet](http://www.hoovers.com:Shanghai Bacardi Co, Ltd factsheet) (23 August 2007) (510139)
- 5 - [www.bacardi.com](http://www.bacardi.com):8 January 2002 (12181)
- 6 - Bacardi & Company Limited Corporate Communications: [www.bacardi.com](http://www.bacardi.com) (22 August 2007) (509673)
- 7 - [www.ratb.org.uk:www.ratb.org.uk/html/who.html](http://www.ratb.org.uk:www.ratb.org.uk/html/who.html) (22 August 2007) (509675)
- 8 - Multinational Monitor:Vol. 25, No. 10 (October 2004) (243033)
- 9 - [www.publiceye.org](http://www.publiceye.org) profile of CANF:8 January 2002 (12606)
- 10 - [www.buyblue.org](http://www.buyblue.org):[www.buyblue.org/archives](http://www.buyblue.org/archives) (April 2005) (257602)
- 11 - Hoovers 2007 [www.hoovers.com:Bacardi & Company Limited factsheet](http://www.hoovers.com:Bacardi & Company Limited factsheet) (23 August 2007) (510144)
- 12 - Christian Dior SA Corporate Communications:Annual Report 2004 (2004) (254725)
- 13 - Diageo plc Corporate Communications:Corporate Citizenship Report (August 2006) (508719)
- 14 - [www.business-humanrights.org](http://www.business-humanrights.org):Douala: chemical pollution in Bassa neighbourhood (17 August 2006) (295632)
- 15 - ENDS Report:372 (January 2006) (January 2006) (284134)
- 16 - Diageo plc Corporate Communications:Diageo Corporate Citizenship Report 2003 (1 January 2003) (214479)
- 17 - Corporate Watch (UK) website [www.corporatewatch.org.uk](http://www.corporatewatch.org.uk):Corporate Involvement in and around the G8 2005 in Scotland: Bringing the G8 home (8 December 2005) (278236)
- 18 - ARC News:December 2003 (1 December 2003) (223226)
- 19 - Sunday Mail (Scotland):15th May 2005 (15 May 2005) (257663)
- 20 - Diageo plc Corporate Communications:[www.diageo.com/en-row/AboutDiageo/OurMarkets/](http://www.diageo.com/en-row/AboutDiageo/OurMarkets/) (23 August 2007) (510148)
- 21 - Corporate Watch newsletter:issue 24 (June/July 2005) (June 2005) (263431)
- 22 - Diageo plc Corporate Communications:Corporate Citizenship Supplier Standards - Partnering with Suppliers (23 August 2007) (510146)
- 23 - Diageo plc Corporate Communications:Corporate Citizenship Report (2005) (271163)
- 24 - International Chamber of Commerce ICC [www.iccwbo.org](http://www.iccwbo.org): [www.iccwbo.org](http://www.iccwbo.org) (16 May 2007) (312527)
- 25 - SustainAbility:Influencing Power: Reviewing the conduct and content of corporate lobbying (2005) (504196)
- 26 - Labour Research:Vol 95 no 8 (August 2006) (295340)
- 27 - Labour Research:Vol 94 no 9 (September 2005) (September 2005) (270671)
- 28 - Fortune Brands Corporate Communications:Statement of Environmental Stewardship (January 2005) (510483)
- 29 - [www.scottycameron.com/products/accessories/details.asp?type=headcovers&id=17](http://www.scottycameron.com/products/accessories/details.asp?type=headcovers&id=17) (10 October 2007) (513456)
- 30 - [www.titleist.com/corporate/contact.asp](http://www.titleist.com/corporate/contact.asp) (10 October 2007) (513443)
- 31 - Maxxium Corporate Communications:[www.maxxium.com](http://www.maxxium.com) (6 September 2007) (512093)
- 32 - Maquiladora/Manufacturing in Mexico's Border Region:26 March 2005 (253696)
- 33 - Hazards:80 (Oct-Dec 2002) (1 October 2002) (6700)
- 34 - Fortune Brands Corporate Communications:Global Citizenship Policy (January 2005) (510482)
- 35 - Fortune Brands Corporate Communications:[www.fortunebrands.com/downloads/2006\\_report.pdf](http://www.fortunebrands.com/downloads/2006_report.pdf) (21 August 2007) (509500)
- 36 - London & Scottish International Corporate Communications:London & Scottish Environmental Policy (May 2006) (511621)
- 37 - London & Scottish International Corporate Communications:Email from a senior manager responsible

- for environmental policy (28 August 2007) (511627)
- 38 - Vinceremos Corporate Communications:www.vinceremos.co.uk (6 September 2007) (512122)
- 39 - London & Scottish International Corporate Communications:www.junipergreen.org (22 August 2007) (509524)
- 40 - London & Scottish International Corporate Communications:www.uk5.org (6 September 2007) (512123)
- 41 - London & Scottish International Corporate Communications:Shop survey (August 2007) (512121)
- 42 - LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA Corporate Communications:Preserving The Environment 2006 (2006) (507444)
- 43 - Greenpeace's Chemical Home website:Cleaning up Our Chemical Homes (2nd Edition) February 2007 (6 September 2007) (512100)
- 44 - Greenpeace's Chemical Home website: www.greenpeace.org.uk/Products/toxics/chemicalhouse... (7 September 2005) (270372)
- 45 - Naturewatch Compassionate Shopping Guide:10th edition, (2007) (274107)
- 46 - International Fur Trade Federation website www.fur-style.com:On the Catwalk & Spotlight On Fur www.fur-style.com (24 August 2005) (268246)
- 47 - LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA Corporate Communications:www.lvmh.com (22 August 2007) (509580)
- 48 - Clean Clothes Campaign newsletter:23 (May 2007) (504094)
- 49 - Lucky Group Corporate Communications:www.lucky.com.hk (7 October 2005) (298871)
- 50 - Looking for a Quick Fix: How weak social auditing is keeping workers in sweatshops:Looking for a Quick Fix: How weak social auditing is keeping workers in sweatshops (November 2005) (276212)
- 51 - Labour Behind the Label:No 21. March 2004 (3 August 2004) (230107)
- 52 - LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SA Corporate Communications:Annual Report 2006 (2006) (507331)
- 53 - DKNY Corporate Communications:DKNY homepage www.dkny.com (4 May 2006) (289786)
- 54 - National Mobilization Against Sweatshops NMASS website www.nmass.org:www.nmass.org/nmass/fight.html (7 September 2007) (512164)
- 55 - National Mobilization Against Sweatshops NMASS website www.nmass.org:www.nmass.org/nmass/fight.html (24 August 2005) (268367)
- 56 - Big Campaign Website (Boycott Israeli Goods) www.bigcampaign.org:Israeli goods to boycott www.bigcampaign.org/boycott.html (24 August 2005) (268370)
- 57 - Pernod-Ricard SA Corporate Communications:Annual Report 2005/2006 (July 2006) (511704)
- 58 - Pernod-Ricard SA Corporate Communications:www.pernod-ricard.com (5 September 2007) (511709)
- 59 - Pernod-Ricard SA Corporate Communications:Environmental & Social Responsibility (2006) (511654)
- 60 - Pernod-Ricard SA Corporate Communications:Environment (4 September 2007) (511639)
- 61 - National Foreign Trade Council www.nftc.org:www.nftc.org (25 May 2007) (502550)
- 62 - National Foreign Trade Council www.nftc.org:22 February 2004 (221632)
- 63 - Vegetarian Society Approved Products: Approved beer (5 May 2006) (288585)
- 64 - Scottish & Newcastle plc Corporate Communications:www.johnsmiths.co.uk (5 May 2006) (290037)
- 65 - Scottish & Newcastle plc Corporate Communications:CSR Report (2005) (312020)
- 66 - Scottish & Newcastle plc Corporate Communications:S&N Annual Report (2005) (288440)
- 67 - Guardian Unlimited / Guardian website www.guardian.co.uk:S & N Denies Allegations of unlawful tactics in Russia (26 July 2005) (263935)
- 68 - Edrington Group (The):Environmental policy (28 August 2007) (510471)
- 69 - Edrington Group (The):www.edringtongroup.com/company/aboutus/history.asp (21 August 2007) (509474)
- 70 - Whyte & Mackay Ltd Corporate Communications:www.whyteandmackay.com (21 August 2007) (509425)
- 71 - UB Group Corporate Communications:Pegasus: In-house magazine of the UB Group (April 2007) (512079)
- 72 - Financeasia.com:United Breweries Group acquires Whyte & Mackay (17 May 2007) (512068)
- 73 - UB Group Corporate Communications:www.theubgroup.com/ (5 September 2007) (512010)
- 74 - UB Group Corporate Communications:Pegasus: In-house magazine of the UB Group (January 2007) (512076)
- 75 - V&S Vin and Sprit AB Corporate Communications:V & S Group Annual Report 2006 (2006) (511810)
- 76 - V&S Vin and Sprit AB Corporate Communications:www.absolut.co.uk (6 September 2007) (512091)
- 77 - V&S Vin and Sprit AB Corporate Communications:www.vsgroup.com (2 June 2005) (258638)
- 78 - V&S Vin and Sprit AB Corporate Communications:Workplace (5 September 2007) (511818)
- 79 - V&S Vin and Sprit AB Corporate Communications:www.vsgroup.com (5 September 2007) (511789)
- 80 - Organic Spirits Company Corporate Communications:Phone call (25 September 2007) (512691)
- 81 - UB Group Corporate Communications:www.theubgroup.com/ (5 September 2007) (512010)