

THANK YOU FOR DOWNLOADING THIS ETHICAL CONSUMER RESEARCH REPORT.

It contains a buyers' guide complete with:

- a detailed article
- rankings table
- Best Buy advice
- all the stories behind the marks on the table
- company ownership and contact details
- full list of references

Subscribe to Ethical Consumer and get instant access to over 80 similar reports (worth over £240) as part of your subscription. Subscribers also get:

Ethical Consumer magazine

- keeping you up to date with all the latest ethical news and analysis

- Unique buyers' guides with detailed ratings tables, Best Buys advice, company profiles, news, boycotts, comment and more
- Online back issues archive
- Available in print through the post or as a digital download



Unlimited, 24 hour access to our premium website ethiscore.org

- helping you choose the most ethical brands

- Customise Ethiscores to reflect the issues you care most about
- Ethiscore is updated daily by our team of dedicated researchers
- The latest scores for the brands in all the Research Reports

Brand	Rating (out of 20)
Equal Exchange Tea (100%)	17
Hampton's Tea (100%)	17
Harney & Sons Tea (100%)	17
Barclay Organic Tea (100%)	17
Steele's Organic Tea (100%)	17

Access all these print and web products for just 58p a week.

Sign up and unlock all our content for the introductory offer price of just £29.95 a year (normally £34).

You can cancel at any time in the first four weeks for a full refund.

Subscribe via our website (click the sign up tab below), or call us on 0161 226 2929 (Monday to Friday).

 **trial sign up**

"Ethical Consumer helps me know the real story of what I'm buying." Mr Cassy, Suffolk



A Nation of Animal Lovers?



Vegetarian dog food **Ami, Benevo, Yarrah, Wackidog** (Ami contains L-Carnitine). Yarrah is also organic.

Vegetarian cat food **Ami, Benevo** – both of which contain taurine and arachidonic acid.

Yarrah is currently investigating the possibilities of producing a vegetarian cat food in the near future.



Organic meat dog and cat food – **OrganiPets and Yarrah**.



Katy Brown looks beyond the label to find out what you're actually feeding your moggie or pooch, and gets to grips with some meaty dilemmas.

Ingredients

It's more than likely, if you have a pet, that when buying their food your primary concern will be that you feed them a nutritious diet that promotes their health and well-being. But according to the Campaign For Real Pet Food (CFRP), pet food is not covered by the same labelling legislation as food for human consumption. So it can be hard to know exactly what you're feeding your pets if you buy the average pet food. 'EC permitted additives' can include artificial colours such as tartrazine and sunset yellow which have been shown to cause hyperactivity in children and have been banned by the Food Standards Agency. Blue 2, in addition, has been linked to tumour growth, as have antioxidants such as BHA.¹ In all, 4,000 chemicals are covered by the term 'EC permitted additives'. Many of these are in all likelihood harmless – but how can you know if you simply don't know what's in the pet food you buy? The use of vague terms doesn't help. 'Meat and animal derivatives' can cover anything scraped up off the slaughterhouse floor, from any animal, while 'derivatives of vegetable origin' includes all vegetable by-products, from processed vegetables to residues such as charcoal, and 'cereals' covers wheat, barley, oats, maize and more. This can be particularly problematic if an animal has a dietary allergy. The CPRF is campaigning for change in pet food labelling to remove such ill-defined terms. Of the brands on the table OrganiPets and

Naturediet are promoted on the campaign group's website. In addition, Burns, Arden Grange and Pero have been set up specifically to provide more natural, wholesome alternatives to mainstream pet food brands and have more transparent ingredient labelling.

Compassion beyond the domestic beast

For many, compassion for animals goes beyond their own cat or dog. It is ironic, then, that two of the main ethical issues surrounding pet food are treatment of the animals that usually go into pet food, and the testing of pet foods on other animals.


Not all animals get to go walkies

Of the companies on the table, most sell factory farmed meat. Of those that sell meat-based pet foods, only OrganiPets and Yarrah sell exclusively organic meat. Pero offers organic dog and cat food. Mars (Whiskas), Morrisons and Sainsbury's all offer organic cat food, however all of these companies also sell factory-farmed pet food. Burns offers organic dog food and has animal welfare criteria for the rest of its food – it does not use caged chickens, its fish is from sustainable sources and it specifies to suppliers that all meat must be from non-intensive sources.



image © Coldfusion | Dreamstime.com

isttime.com

	Ethiscore (out of 20)	Environment				Animals			People				Politics				+ve				
		Environmental Reporting	Nuclear Power	Climate Change	Pollution & Toxics	Habitats & Resources	Animal Testing	Factory Farming	Animal Rights	Human Rights	Workers' Rights	Supply Chain Policy	Irresponsible Marketing	Arms & Military Supply	Genetic Engineering	Boycott Call	Political Activity	Anti-Social Finance		Company Ethos	Product Sustainability
BRAND																					COMPANY GROUP
DOG FOOD																					
Yarrah [V, O]	15							●			●							★	2		Roelevink Beheer BV
Ami [V]	14.5										●							☆	1		Vegeco
Benevo [V]	14.5										●										Vegeco
Organipets [O]	14							●			●							★	1		OrganiPets Ltd
Wackidog [V]	14	○									●							★	0.5		Triangle Wholefoods
Yarrah [O]	14							●			●							★	1		Roelevink Beheer BV
Burns [O]	10.5	●						●	●		●			○					1		Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd
Pero [O]	10.5	●						●	●		●			○					1		Pero (Foods) Ltd
Burns (Penlan Farm) [V]	10	●						●	●		●			○					0.5		Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd
Arden Grange	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Arden Grange Holdings
Butcher's	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							FW Baker
Naturediet	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							NatureDiet Pet Foods
Pero	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Pero (Foods) Ltd
Trophy	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Trophy Int'l Animal Products
V-Dog [V]	9.5	●					●	●	●		●			○					1		Judges Choice Pet Food
Vitalin	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Kennel Nutrition
Wafcol [V]	9.5	●					●	●	●		●			○					1		Armitage Pet Care/Focus 100
Wagg	8.5	●					●	●	●		●			○							Wagg Foods
Co-op	6.5			○		●	○	●	●	○	○		●	○	○		●	○	★		Co-operative Group
Sainsbury's	4.5	○		○		●	●	●	●	●	○	●		○				○			J Sainsbury
Hill's Science Plan	3.5	○		○	○	●	●	●	●	●		●	○	○	●	○	○				Colgate-Palmolive
Morrisons	3	○		●	○	●	●	●	●	○	●	●		○			●				Wm Morrison Supermarket
Cesar/Chappie/Pedigree	2	○		○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	●	○				Mars Inc
Tesco	0.5	○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	○	●				Tesco
Bakers/Winalot	0.5	○		○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	●	●				Nestlé
Asda	0	○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	●				Wal-Mart Supermarkets
Eukanuba/IAMS	0	○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	○				Procter & Gamble
CAT FOOD																					
Ami [V]	14.5										●							☆	1		Vegeco
Benevo [V]	14.5										●							☆	1		Vegeco
Organipets [O]	14							●			●							★	1		OrganiPets Ltd
Yarrah [O]	14							●			●							★	1		Roelevink Beheer BV
Pero [O]	10.5	●						●	●		●			○					1		Pero (Foods) Ltd
Arden Grange	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Arden Grange Holdings
Burns	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd
Trophy	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Trophy Int'l Animal Products
Vitalin	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							Kennel Nutrition
Classic	9.5	●						●	●		●			○							FW Baker
Co-op	6.5			○		●	○	●	●	○	○		●	○	○		●	○	★		Co-operative Group
Hill's Science Plan	3.5	○		○	○	●	●	●	●	●		●	○	○	○	●	○	○			Colgate-Palmolive
Sainsbury's [O]	5.5	○		○		●	●	●	●	●	○	●		○			○		1		J Sainsbury
Morrisons [O]	4	○		●	○	●	●	●	●	○	●	●		○			●		1		Wm Morrison Supermarket
Whiskas [O]	3	○		○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	●	○		1		Mars Inc
Kitekat/Sheba	2	○		○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	●	○				Mars Inc
Go-Cat/Felix	0.5	○		○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	●	●				Nestlé
Tesco	0.5	○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		○	●	○	●				Tesco
Asda	0	○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	●				Wal-Mart Supermarkets
Eukanuba/IAMS	0	○		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	○				Procter & Gamble

USING THE TABLES [O] = Organic [V] = Vegetarian/Vegan ● bottom rating ○ middle rating □ top rating (no criticisms)

Ethiscore: the higher the score, the better the company across the criticism categories. See 'Our Rating System' page at www.ethicalconsumer.org for category definitions. **Positive ratings (+ve):** Company Ethos: ★ full mark ☆ half mark Product Sustainability: Maximum of five positive marks

This is very positive but is not a guarantee that meat is free range. The company is about to launch the 'Penlan Farm' range of foods, produced from its own farm with high standards of animal welfare.

Troubling testing

It may come as an unpleasant surprise to pet owners that many pet food companies have been involved in invasive tests on animals. In 2006 the US Department of Agriculture investigated a complaint by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) regarding invasive testing of Procter & Gamble's IAMS brand following an undercover investigation. The USDA agreed that the laboratory had failed to provide veterinary care and pain relief to suffering animals, failed to provide animals with adequate space, and failed to train employees – along with nearly 40 other violations of the federal Animal Welfare Act. After intense pressure from PETA, IAMS agreed to make significant changes: to sever ties to the research centre in question; to end all invasive and terminal experiments on dogs and cats; and to begin conducting humane in-home tests for palatability studies. According to the company, approximately 70% of the animals it now conducts tests on reside at home with their families. However the company still keeps up to 700 dogs and cats in its laboratory for nutritional studies.² While companies seek to make laboratory conditions sound acceptable, according to the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), in many cases dogs are kennelled for much or all of their lives without adequate mental, physical or social stimulation. Housing conditions of animals can have a substantial effect, not only on their well-being, but also on their physiological functions, calling into question the validity of the results of such studies.³ IAMS has also refused to end invasive experiments on species other than dogs and cats. In one case IAMS funded a two-year study in which experimenters taped the tails of mice to the tops of cages to keep their hind legs suspended in the air and cause the wasting away of muscle tissue. When PETA

protested, the experiment was cut short. PETA is continuing to press IAMS to ban invasive or terminal experiments on all species and to adopt humane 'in-home' testing, and is calling for a boycott of IAMS and Eukanuba until they do so.³

All four of the larger pet food manufacturing companies – Nestlé, Colgate-Palmolive, Procter & Gamble and Mars have in the past conducted invasive animal testing of pet foods. Although all now claim not to conduct invasive tests none of them would be endorsed by any of the campaign groups that work on these issues – all are actively involved in animal testing of other consumer products. They are all subject to a boycott call by Uncaged.⁴ Captive animals are also used to conduct non-invasive palatability tests of Sainsbury's own-label pet food. No information was found from the other supermarkets so there is no guarantee this is not the case for them too – particularly as, despite receiving a worst rating for animal testing, Sainsbury's has the most stringent, if inadequate, animal testing policy of the major supermarkets. Waggs, Judge's Choice (V-Dog) and Focus100 (Wafcol) did not respond to our requests for animal testing policies so they all receive our worst rating, although this doesn't necessarily mean that they actually conduct animal testing.

Cruelty-free brands

When we last covered pet food in 2005 the BUAV was operating its 'No Animal Testing Pet Food Standard.' Unfortunately the BUAV Standard is no longer operating. However, anti-vivisection group Uncaged regularly contacts the formerly approved companies for confirmation that they still adhere to the Standard's requirements: to prove that neither they nor their suppliers engage in invasive laboratory experiments or keep animals in captive conditions for lengthy periods of time. Those that adhere to the standards and which are included in this report are Arden Grange, Burns, NatureDiet, Pero and Trophy.

PETA UK have their own less stringent scheme which requires companies to promise that they are not directly funding

or conducting any cruel and abusive animal testing for their pet foods, but doesn't cover supplier practices. On PETA's approved list in this report: Ami, Benevo, OrganiPets, Vitalin, Yarrah and the Co-op.

Good news which is not reflected on either list is that Butcher's, which received a worst rating for its animal testing policy in our last pet food report (for having a third party supplier with kennels on-site) now receives a best rating. The company only conducts palatability tests in the pets' home setting.

All of Suma's products, including Wackidog, are BUAV approved.

Meaty dilemmas and carbon pawprints

Buying organic pet food avoids some of the ethical issues around the meat industry, including the miserable conditions that animals have to endure on factory farms. But it doesn't avoid the grim reality of the slaughterhouse. Animals from both free range/organic and factory farms all end up on the same factory line of death. It can be hard as an animal lover to reconcile feeding your much loved animal with financing the gruesome meat industry, no matter how high the welfare standards on the farm.

In addition, buying organic only avoids some of environmental impacts of meat. A recent article in New Scientist magazine gained a lot of attention after claiming that owning a dog could have a higher environmental impact than driving an SUV. The analysis took the average diet of a medium sized dog – 164kg of meat and 95 kg of cereals a year – and worked out how much land this would take to produce, arriving at an 'environmental footprint' of 0.84 hectares. This was compared to an SUV driven 10,000 km a year, using 55.1 gigajoules of energy per year. Assuming one hectare produces 135 gigajoules of energy per year the SUV's 'footprint' was calculated at 0.41 hectares, less than half that of the dog.⁵ This rapidly translated into headlines such as "Study says dogs have larger carbon footprint than SUV". Of course the study says more about the environmental cost of a meat diet than the

Katy's cats

I've had experience of experimenting with vegan cat food with my own cats. As a vegan myself it was an ethical dilemma supporting the meat trade to feed my pets, and I was unhappy with the contents of standard pet food. My cats enjoyed their dry vegan biscuits and ate them happily but did lose a little weight, and after a while one of them lost the shine to his coat (though many report this happening with a change from one meat based food to another). I supplemented Gemma's diet with fish scraps from the fishmongers which she enjoyed but these made Pepys sick, so I began supplementing his diet with standard organic cat food from a supermarket, as it was the easiest way to get hold of it. They did well on this combination for a while but Pepys developed an allergy which led to him only being

able to eat one kind of veterinary-prescribed food made by one of the lowest scoring companies in this report! This meant I could no longer leave biscuits down for Gemma as Pepys would eat them so I began to just feed her organic meat cat food, as well as some fish scraps; preparing those for her everyday was just too time consuming. It was all very difficult ethically but I had to do what was best for my cats. I do however know of people having great success in feeding their cats on a vegan diet.

Putting together this report, with the issue of feeding veggie/non-veggie diets, I've felt a great responsibility towards all animals involved – farm animals, pets, and their human guardians. Please write to us with any comments or additional information that others may find useful.



ethics of animal ownership. Critics pointed out that this 'environmental footprint' does not equate to a carbon

footprint, and the vast majority of SUVs do not run on plant energy, thus the comparison as a climate impact is meaningless.²⁰ And 10,000km is about half the mileage of an average UK driver. Moreover, much meat in pet food is, as we noted above, slaughterhouse by-product, therefore according to the same eco-footprint as meat for human consumption is questionable.

None of which is to deny the real environmental impact of pet foods. But whatever the correct figures, that impact suggests one thing to reduce your carbon footprint: minimising the meat in your pet's diet.

Buying dry instead of wet pet food is more ecologically friendly as much of the weight of wet food is actually water. Earlier reviews of pet food in Ethical Consumer however, have found some readers opposed to dry foods on health grounds.

Feeding your animal leftovers, or scraps from the fishmonger or butcher that would otherwise be thrown out, is another good way to reduce their impact on the planet.

Where environmentalists and animal welfare campaigners (of course many consider themselves to be both) may find common ground is in the notion that we should stop breeding animals as pets, and instead only give homes to animals in need. If you provide a home to an unwanted animal it could be argued that you aren't creating any overall additional impact. And given that many cats and dogs are put down every week in animal

rescue centres due to a lack of available homes, many consider it irresponsible to let your pet breed.

Poor working conditions are also a prevalent problem in the meat industry, with employers taking advantage of vulnerable, often migrant, workers with few employment options. Evidence of discrimination is so strong in the sector that last year the Equality and Human Rights Commission began its first statutory inquiry into the UK meat industry.⁶

Veggie pets – fit as a butcher's dog?

For any or all of these reasons you may consider trying your pet on a vegetarian diet. This is simpler for dogs than for cats, as dogs are naturally omnivores in the wild whereas cats are carnivores. And anyone who thinks vegetarian pet diets are 'unnatural' might like to stop and consider what's 'natural' about the 'junk pet food' churned out by the major pet food manufacturers. The most important thing is to ensure your animal is fed a nutritionally complete diet however it is sourced. Cats require specific nutrients, not specific feedstuffs⁷ and a 2006 study undertaken, perhaps bizarrely, by Nestlé, found that the 34 vegetarian cats it looked at were apparently healthy.⁸

One of the biggest concerns raised with vegetarian/vegan cats is the risk of a taurine deficiency which can lead to blindness and death if not treated. However most meaty cat foods have taurine added back into it as the processing of meats removes the natural taurine. Another essential for cats is arachidonic acid. Both these substances are available in synthetic form. Vegan cats, particularly males, are more likely to suffer urinary tract problems – which is extremely common in cats anyway. The FAQ section of www.VeganCats.com is an excellent source of information on mitigating these problems (see Links). Even among animal rights organisations the jury is still out on feeding

cats a veggie diet. A sensible compromise may be to feed your cat a half and half diet of vegetarian biscuits and organic wet food or, even better, waste meat products. Even dogs may struggle to get all their necessary nutrients from commercial vegetarian, or even conventional food, as some dogs require taurine and L-Carnitine, which are not generally added to commercial dog foods.¹⁰

Before deciding to feed your cat a vegetarian or vegan diet you should probably undertake more research than we have room to include here. There is a lot of information available online, although much is anecdotal. Wikipedia is a good place to start.⁹ Always consult a vet if you have concerns about your animal's health.

Company Profiles

Uncaged is calling for a boycott of **Colgate-Palmolive** for animal testing, including for pet food.^{11,4} Bertin, a Brazilian beef exporter, described Colgate-Palmolive as a major client in the hygiene and beauty sector, to which it sells animal by-products such as tallow (rendered beef fat) for use in personal care products, such as soap.¹²

Uncaged is calling for a boycott of **Mars Inc** due to the activities of its pet food division,¹⁴ while PETA's boycott call is for its funding deadly animal tests on a number of its chocolate bars – see www.marscandykills.com for more information.⁴

Nestlé is another target of Uncaged's campaign against companies which test their pet foods on animals.⁴ Nestlé was one of 43 companies that the Colombian Permanent Peoples' Tribunal ruled to have violated human rights in Colombia after a three year investigation.¹⁵ An international panel including judges, university

Vegepet is a powder supplement for vegetarian/vegan cat diets (see VeggiePets.com in Links).

The Organic Pet Co and **Trophy** both produce organic dog biscuits.

www.rawmeatybones.com advises on how to feed your animal a more natural diet.





L-Carnitine and taurine supplements can be purchased from health food shops.

Do one thing – Pet food is one of those few things, like loo roll, that if you run out – you have to replace pretty fast – meaning you won't always find a best buy. If you only do one thing then avoid the companies which are subject to a boycott call over animal testing and write to them telling them, so they know it's affecting sales (see addresses on page 41).

image © Gvictoria | Dreamstime.com

Price comparison (ranked by price of dry food)







Cat Food

Brand Name	£Price	
	Wet / 100g	Dry / kg
Eukanuba		9.98
Yarrah Organic 	0.55	7.21
Hill's Science Plan	0.65	6.92
Ami 		6.01
Arden Grange		5.68
Pero Organic		5.16
OrganiPets 		4.83
IAMS	0.56	4.37
Burns	0.81	4.00
Trophy	0.26	3.50
Benevo 	0.52	3.40
Go-cat		3.25
Whiskas	0.38	3.13
Vitalin		2.15
Sainsbury's	0.21	1.07
Asda	0.12	1.02
Tesco	0.27	0.97
Morrisons Organic		0.39
Morrisons		0.13
Wet only by price		
Sheba	0.49	
Whiskas Organic	0.40	
Co-op	0.36	
Kitekat	0.24	
Felix	0.28	
Sainsbury's Organic	0.20	
Classic	0.12	

professors, indigenous authorities and a Nobel Laureate presided over the ruling. **Procter & Gamble** is subject to a boycott call by **Uncaged** over animal testing, including for its pet food.^{11,4} **Uncaged** uncovered evidence of an experiment commissioned by the company where mice were genetically engineered to be more vulnerable to asthma and lung damage before being injected with an ingredient, damaging their lungs and causing pneumonia.¹¹

Arden Grange, **Burns** and **Vitalin** all receive additional criticism in the animal rights category for selling meat, and for having schemes for pet breeders.^{16, 17, 18} However it was noted that **Burns** made charitable donations to a number of animal rescue organisations.

Dog Food

Brand Name	£Price	
	Wet / 100g	Dry / kilo
Hill's Science Plan	0.47	5.69
Eukanuba		4.80
Burns Organic		4.71
Yarrah Organic & Veg 	0.61	4.70
Yarrah Organic 	0.33	4.70
Arden Grange	0.25	4.49
OrganiPets 		4.44
Ami 		4.17
Burns	0.34	3.80
Benevo 	0.52	3.27
Pero Organic		2.96
Wafcol Vegetarian		2.91
Pedigree	0.13	2.84
IAMS		2.83
Pero		2.43
Bakers		2.40
V-Dog		2.07
Trophy	0.25	1.83
Chappie	0.12	1.67
Sainsbury's	0.11	1.62
Winalot	0.13	1.57
Wagg		1.52
Wackidog 		1.14
Vitalin		1.32
Asda	0.11	0.98
Tesco	0.11	0.85
Morrisons	1.02	0.12
Wet only by price		
Co-op	0.13	
Butcher's	0.16	
Naturediet	0.20	
Cesar	0.55	

Armitage Pet Care, makers of vegetarian dog food **Wafcol**, gains its animal rights mark from selling meat and making dog food specifically for performance greyhounds.¹⁹ Greyhound racing has been heavily criticised by animal welfare rights groups.

Links

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals – PO Box 36678, London SE1 1YE. 020 7357 9229.

British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection – 16a Crane Grove, London N7 8NN, 020 7700 4888.

Uncaged Campaigns – 5th Floor, Alliance House, 9 Leopold Street, Sheffield S1 2GY. 0114 272 2220.

Campaign For Real Pet Food – 99 Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RY 0845 3880935

VeganCats.com – 1701 Pearl St. Unit 8, Waukesha, WI 53186 USA

VegePets.com – c/o Vegeco Ltd (Unit 5 Downley Point Downley Road, Havant, Hampshire PO9 2NA. 023 9245 3355.

The Animal Protection Agency – committed to ceasing the trade in wildlife for pets.APA, Brighton Media Centre, 68 Middle Street, Brighton BN1 1AL. 0273 674253.

If you're looking to home an animal try the RSPCA, Dog's Trust or Cat's Protection:

RSPCA – Enquiries Service, Wilberforce Way, Southwater, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 9RS. www.rspca.org.uk 0300 1234 555.

Dogs Trust – 17 Wakley Street, London EC1V 7RQ. 0207 837 0006.

Cats Protection – National Cat Centre, Chelwood Gate, Haywards Heath, Sussex RH17 7TT. 03000 12 12 12.

Alternatively look them up in the phone book for your local branch.

Unfortunately the RSPCA put hundreds of animals to sleep every week. That means if you home an animal from them you will undoubtedly be saving its life. If you are looking to donate to an animal rescue organisation, however, ones with a no-kill policy include:

Hillside Animal Sanctuary – Hall Lane, Frettenham, Norwich NR12 7LT. 01603 738520. www.hillside.org.uk.

Friend Farmed Animal Rescue – Linton View, 89 Bush Rd, East Peckham, Tonbridge, Kent, TN12 5LJ. 01622 871 617. www.friendsanimalrescue.org.uk.

Freshfield Animal Rescue Centre - East Lodge Farm, East Lane, Ince Blundell, Liverpool L29 3EA. 0151 931 1604. www.freshfieldsrescue.org.uk

References: 1 www.crpfl.org.uk FAQs 20/01/10 2 www.iamscruelty.com 29/01/10 3 BUAV Factsheet H1 'Pet Food' December 2005 4 [Uncaged website www.uncaged.co.uk](http://www.uncaged.co.uk): Petfood 6/01/10 5 How green is your pet? www.newscientist.com 23/10/09 6 www.equalityhumanrights.com 29/01/10 7 Nutrient requirements of dogs and cats, National Research Council (U.S.). Ad Hoc Committee on Dog and Cat Nutrition, 2001 8 Surprise: Most 'veggie' cats are healthy 1/10/09 9 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cat_food#Vegetarian_or_vegan_food 29/01/10 10 www.peta.org/factsheet/files/FactsheetDisplay.asp?ID=34 Meatless Meals for Dogs and Cats viewed 29/01/10 11 [Uncaged website www.uncaged.co.uk](http://www.uncaged.co.uk) 8/01/10 12 Slaughtering the Amazon, Greenpeace International 01/06/09 13 ASA Adjudication on Mars UK Ltd, 17/10/07 14 PETA websites: www.marscandykills.com, 6/01/10 15 Business & Human Rights Resource Centre: Permanent Peoples' Tribunal, Colombia, 24/07/08 16 www.ardengrango.com 14/01/10 17 www.burnspet.co.uk 13/01/10 18 www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk 12/01/10 19 www.armitages.co.uk 13/20/10 20 www.newscientist.com/article/mg20427311.600-how-green-is-your-pet.html

cat and dog food

Ami Cat Food [A]

Owned by Vegeco

Vegeco Ltd, Unit 5 Downley Point, Downley Road, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 2NA

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Vegetarian company (January 2010)

According to the Vegeco website, www.vegeco.net, viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, the company sold only vegetarian products, including alternatives to meat based products for consumption by both humans and pets, and were therefore considered by Ethical Consumer to be providing environmental alternatives. The company was exempt from filing accounts with Companies House and therefore presumably had a turnover under £5 million so also received a best rating for environmental reporting by Ethical Consumer. (ref: 1)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Vegeco website, www.vegeco.net, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 1)

Politics

Company Ethos

(See also 'Vegetarian company' in Environmental Reporting above.)

Product sustainability

Animal Welfare Features

Vegan product approved by the Vegetarian Society (January 2010)

According to the Vegeco website, www.vegeco.net, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, all Ami products were vegan and approved by the Vegetarian Society. (ref: 1)

Arden Grange Cat Food

Owned by Leander International Pet Foods Ltd.

Leander International Pet Foods Ltd. is owned by Arden Grange Holdings Ltd

Arden Grange Holdings Ltd, London Road, Albourne, Hassock, Sussex, BN6 9BJ, UK

Arden Grange Holdings Ltd also owns Arden Grange Dog Food

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst Ethical Consumer rating for environmental reporting (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the Arden Grange website, www.ardengrange.com, when viewed

by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 2)

Animals

Factory farming

Sale of non-free range meat (January 2010)

Arden Grange's range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.ardengrange.com, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, had meat as a major ingredient. The meat used by the company did not appear to be organic or free range. (ref: 2)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of non-free range meat' in Factory farming above.)

Encouraging pet breeding (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer searched the Arden Grange website, www.ardengrange.com, in January 2010 and found that the company operated a breeders club, the benefits of which included purchasing food at substantial savings on retail prices. Given that many cats and dog are put down every week due to a lack of available homes and animal rescue centres struggle with the sheer numbers of unwanted animals, it was considered irresponsible of Arden Grange to be encouraging pet breeding in this way. (ref: 2)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Arden Grange website, www.ardengrange.com, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 2)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

GM policy (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer searched the Arden Grange website, www.ardengrange.com, in January 2010. Under a section entitled 'Pet Food Ingredients Provenance' it said no genetically modified ingredients.

However the website did not refer to animal feed or animal products. As the company sold pet food containing meat it was likely that, in the absence of a more explicit policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there was a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 2)

Arthurs Cat Food

Owned by Nestlé Purina Petcare

Nestlé Purina Petcare is owned by Nestlé SA

Nestlé SA, Avenue Nestlé 55, Vevey, Vaud 1800, Switzerland

Nestlé SA also owns Felix cat food and Go-Cat Cat Food and Winalot Dog Food

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for environmental reporting (2008)

Nestlé's 2008 Environmental Report "Creating Shared values"

was viewed on the company website in January 2009. This document contained a lot of precise information about previous performance and a number of targets for future performance. The company's EPIs (Environmental performance indicators) were said to be verified independently by Bureau Veritas. However, the report did not give quantified reporting on the company's environmental impacts through agriculture. As the world's largest food company in terms of sales these impacts will undoubtedly be some of Nestlé's most significant environmental impacts. Ethical Consumer did not consider therefore that the report showed a reasonable understanding of all of the company's environmental impacts. Nestlé received a middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 3)

Climate Change

Palm oil supplier accused of rainforest destruction (July 2007)

According to a report by Friends of the Earth Netherlands referred to on the Climate Change Corporation website dated 5 July 2007 (www.ClimateChangeCorp.com), a supplier of palm oil to Nestlé, Wilmar Trading Pte, had 'illegally logged rainforests and violated the rights of local communities in Indonesia'. (ref: 4)

Climate change impacts of palm oil (2007)

According to an article in the Guardian newspaper, www.guardian.co.uk, dated 8th November 2007, in 2007 environmental group Greenpeace had accused major food companies such as Nestlé of potentially creating a climate change catastrophe due to their high use of palm oil. Oil palm plantations used by major food companies were said to be resulting in the release of CO2 stored in massive peat deposits in Indonesia. As well as destroying huge areas of habitats of endangered species, the destruction of the peat bogs was said to be likely to contribute massively to climate change emissions. (ref: 5)

Pollution & Toxics

Campaign against odour from London coffee plant (2007)

According to the March 2007 issue of the ENDS Report, Nestlé's Hayes site, near London, UK, was issued with an integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC) permit for its coffee-roasting process. It said the Environment Agency had already regulated its combustion processes under the previous IPC regime. It said the plant, which had caused a long-running odour and dust problem, would be required to submit an odour management plan by 31st October 2007, detailing existing and alternative control measures. It said local people told of nausea and headaches and being unable to open their windows or use their gardens on hot summer days and a 30-strong residents' protest group called Community Against Pollution had been formed to fight for a solution. Hillingdon Borough Council had apparently found insufficient grounds to serve an emissions abatement notice, saying that incidents only occurred during cleaning and maintenance or when there was a fault in the control of dust or odour emissions, but the response from an October 2006 judicial review of this decision was awaited. According to ENDS, complaints had been halved since Nestlé installed a new chimney in 2003, but 20 to 40 complaints were still being received each year. (ref: 6)

Pollution criticism in oppressive regime (2006)

According to the November 1st 2006 issue of CSR Asia Weekly, in 2006 Nestlé Sources Shanghai Ltd was one of several companies which were joint ventures between multinational corporations and local Chinese businesses which had been put on a blacklist by the Chinese authorities for pollution incidents. Nestlé Sources Shanghai was said to have commenced operations before a proper wastewater treatment facility had passed its environmental assessments. (ref: 8)

Habitats & Resources

(See also 'Palm oil supplier accused of rainforest

destruction' in Climate Change above.)

(See also 'Climate change impacts of palm oil' in Climate Change above.)

Failure to act on palm oil environmental threat (2005)

According to the October 2005 issue of ENDS Report, Nestlé was one of the UK's major users of palm oil, but had refused to respond to environmental groups' concerns about the environmental impact of palm oil production or to join an international round table on the issue established by environmental groups and multinational companies. Logging of Malaysian and Indonesian rainforests to grow oil palms was said to be threatening the existence of endangered species such as orang utans. (ref: 9)

Animals

Animal Testing

Boycott call by Uncaged for animal testing (January 2010)

Many brands made by Nestlé Purina were listed on the Uncaged website's petfood and animal testing page under the 'brands to boycott' section as these products were tested on animals. (ref: 10)

No animal testing policy (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of Nestlé's website www.nestle.com for its animal testing policy. No such policy could be found. It was known that many of the company's subsidiaries were engaged in animal testing. As the world's largest food company in terms of sales it was also likely that Nestlé commissioned at least some animal testing of food products. The company received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for animal testing policy. (ref: 11)

Animal testing (August 2009)

In August 2009 the Alcon Laboratories website, www.alcon.com, stated that the company conducted tests on animals for eye health and eye care products. (ref: 12)

Factory farming

Recall of poisonous pet food (2007)

According to the Summer 2007 issue of Earth Island Journal, March 2007 saw the biggest recall of product in the history of the pet food industry. Nestlé Purina was one of the companies implicated in the scandal, which had seen over 153 brands of pet foods and treats taken off the shelves all over the USA due to it containing wheat gluten and rice protein concentrate which had been contaminated with melamine, a material used to manufacture kitchen utensils and, in China, fertiliser. It said the melamine had been added to the wheat and rice in a bid to increase their protein levels, and had been imported by two US companies from China. The number of reported deaths and illnesses in pets ranged from 16 to more than 3,000, depending on the source. These meat based pet foods were also not labelled as free range so it was assumed the meat was sourced from factory farms. (ref: 13)

Animal Rights

Sale of products containing gelatine (December 2005)

According to the website www.abitofhome.ca, viewed in December 2005, products made by Nestlé, including fruit gums and fruit pastilles contained gelatine. (ref: 14)

Product contained unexpected animal derived ingredients (March 2009)

In March 2009 The Food Magazine reported that strawberry flavour Nestlé's Nesquik Magic Straws were coloured with cochineal, which was derived from crushed insects, but that the product was not labelled as 'unsuitable for vegetarians'. (ref: 15)

Use of ambergris in product (August 2005)

The Cacharel website www.cacharel.com was viewed by ECRA on 31 August 2005, the website stated that Cacharel's Gloria perfume included ambergris, an animal derived product, in its ingredients. (ref: 16)

People

Human Rights

Trade union leader assassinated (11 September 2005)

In an article dated October 2007 published on the Amnesty International website, www.asiapacific.amnesty.org, it was reported that a trade union leader and former employee of Nestlé-CICOLAC, Luciano Enrique Romero Molina, had been assassinated on 11th September 2005. Molina was a local leader of the food workers' union SINALTRAINAL and the human rights organisation Political Prisoners Solidarity Committee. In February 2002, the union was reported to have presented a series of demands for improved working conditions to the Nestlé-CICOLAC company. No agreement was reached and the workers were said to have gone on strike in July 2002. During the strike death threats were said to have been made by paramilitary groups against the strike leaders. Luciano Romero was said to have been sacked in October that year, and subsequently fled the country as a result of death threats. He returned in April 2005. In October 2005 he was said to have been due to travel to Switzerland to attend a meeting as a witness to death threats against trade unionists representing workers in Nestlé plants in Colombia. He was murdered on 11 September 2005 with more than 40 stab wounds on his body. (ref: 17)

Human rights abuses in Colombia (2008)

According to an article which appeared on the Business & Human Rights Resource Centre website (www.business-humanrights.org) on 24 July 2008, The Permanent Peoples' Tribunal (PPT), headed by Nobel peace prize winner, Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, delivered "judgment" on 43 companies after its session on Colombia from 21-23 July, 2008. The Tribunal, consisting of internationally renowned notables, investigated accusations of human rights violations in Colombia for three years, before its ruling.

A total of 43 companies have violated human rights in Colombia, the Tribunal says, one of which was Nestlé. The PPT said the Colombian Government was equally responsible for the violation of human rights, "favoring capital over people's lives". The international companies on the list were given the possibility to respond, but only 6 of the 43 companies on the list took advantage of that."

Nestlé was one of these six, but its comments were only available in Spanish. (ref: 18)

Nestlé worker and union leader killed in Colombia (21 August 2009)

According to a statement posted on the website of the Colombia Solidarity Campaign, www.colombiasolidarity.org.uk, dated August 24th 2009 and signed by Sinaltrainal (Colombian trade union) president, Luis Javier Correa Suarez, on 21 August 2009 strangers arrived at the home of Gustavo Gomez, knocked on the door and when he answered shot him 10 times. Gustavo was a worker at La Rosa SA Nestlé and a member of the trade union Sinaltrainal. He was immediately taken to a local clinic where he died hours later. Gustavo Gómez was a member of the Board of Sinaltrainal Sectional Dosquebradas from 1997 until 2000, was a cousin of Jose De Jesus Marin-Vargas, a worker at Nestlé SA Comestibles La Rosa and member of Sinaltrainal, also murdered on November 22, 2007. According to the article, unfortunately, this crime occurred at a time when Sinaltrainal had submitted a petition to Nestlé Purina PetCare Company de Colombia SA. It stated that this brought the number of Nestlé Sinaltrainal members murdered in Colombia to 12 employees. Luis went on to say the union had previously reported to the authorities the constant threats of death which Sinaltrainal members in Colombia have received and had asked the authorities to investigate and punish those responsible. However, the murders continue while the international community is prepared to accept that unionists are offered state protection and therefore continue to accept the current

regime. He went on to state, "We demand that the Colombian State, investigate and punish the perpetrators and instigators of this crime, protect the lives of members of Sinaltrainal and their families and ensure the right of union activity." (ref: 19)

Workers' Rights

(See also 'Trade union leader assassinated' in Human Rights above.)

Stop the Traffik campaign against child labour farmed cocoa (2007)

According to The Food Magazine July/September 2007, anti-Slavery campaigners Stop the Traffik (STT) had visited 22 schools at the start of a nationwide campaign that showed pupils that nearly half of the chocolate in their tuck shop came from cocoa plantations that used slave labour.

The STT campaign was intended to highlight the plight of thousands of children in the Ivory Coast who were sold by traffickers to cocoa farmers. The children were then forced to harvest the crops that are bought by the British chocolate industry.

Campaigner Mandy Flashman was quoted as saying, "The school kids were shocked to hear that in the Ivory Coast children their age were forced to work on plantations, and would be beaten severely if they tried to escape." An international Labour Organisation report was said to have showed that an estimated 12,000 children had been trafficked into the Ivory Coast, enslaved on cocoa plantations and forced to work long hours. STT chairman Steve Chalke was quoted as saying "The big chocolate manufacturers are not doing enough to stop a slave trade which they are fully aware of." Nestlé, Mars and Cadbury were cited as the main offenders. (ref: 20)

Compensation for tennis elbow injuries (2007)

According to Hazards issue 100 Nestlé has paid compensation to four workers at a site at Burton on Trent after each of them developed tennis elbow - mirroring the experiences of workers at another of the companies' sites in Brazil. Stephen Davis received £11,000, a colleague £4000 at two others undisclosed sums. They were all involved in digging out blocked coffee cyclones - a heavy and prolonged process often taking 3-4 days. (ref: 21)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (2009)

In November 2009 Ethical Consumer downloaded the Nestlé Supplier Code from the company website, www.nestle.com. The document was dated July 2009. It included a section entitled 'Labour Standard', which had clauses to prohibit discrimination and the use of prison and forced labour. It also stated that child labour was prohibited, but did not define this in line with International Labour Organisation conventions. The section on working hours stated that employees should work hours in compliance with all applicable laws and mandatory industry standards, but did not limit working hours in a week to 48 hours and 12 hours overtime. The section on compensation stated that employees must be provided with wages and benefits that comply with applicable laws and binding collective agreements, including those pertaining to overtime work and other premium pay arrangements, but no mention was made of payment of a living wage. No mention was made of freedom of association or independent monitoring of supply chains. The company received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 22)

Irresponsible Marketing

Boycott over baby milk marketing (June 2009)

Ethical Consumer visited the Baby Milk Action website, www.babymilkaction.org, in January 2010 and found its long standing boycott of Nestlé over its irresponsible marketing of breast milk substitutes was ongoing. Boycotters have long accused Nestlé of harming children through the unethical promotion of infant

formula. Nestlé is one of the most boycotted brands in the UK as a result of its activities, Baby Milk Action is one of the organisations which calls for such a boycott. According to Baby Milk Action, which describes itself as a non-profit organisation which aims to save lives and to end the avoidable suffering caused by inappropriate infant feeding Nestlé is targeted with the boycott because monitoring conducted by the International Baby Food Action Network (IBFAN) finds it to be responsible for more violations of the World Health Assembly marketing requirements for baby foods than any other company. It quotes UNICEF “Marketing practices that undermine breastfeeding are potentially hazardous wherever they are pursued: in the developing world, WHO estimates that some 1.5 million children die each year because they are not adequately breastfed. These facts are not in dispute.” It then goes on to say that Nestlé does dispute the facts and directs people to a section of its website for responses to Nestlé’s denials and deception (www.babymilkaction.org/resources/yqsanswered/yqanestle12.html). It states that the boycott will continue until Nestlé accepts and complies with its four-point plan for saving infant lives and ultimately ending the boycott. (ref: 23)

Infringement of baby milk marketing code in 2006 (2006)

According to the April 2006 edition of the Ecologist, Nestlé had lobbied against the World Health Assembly’s International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes in India in 2006. The code was designed to promote adequate nutrition to infants by trying to protect breastfeeding and ensure the appropriate marketing of breastmilk substitutes. Nestlé was said to have lobbied against the Code becoming law, and faced criminal charges over its labelling. The company was said to have issued a writ petition against the Indian government rather than accepting the charges. (ref: 24)

Midwives taken on trip to HQ to promote infant feeding materials (2006)

According to Baby Milk Action Update 38, September 2006 in its July 2006 issue the British Journal of Midwifery ran an article by a group of health workers who had taken an all expenses paid trip to Nestlé HQ in Vevey, Switzerland. The article “The Nestlé issue from an evidence based midwifery perspective” has many errors, distorts the history of the boycott and ignores evidence of ongoing malpractice. It also suggests that midwives should bring Nestlé infant feeding materials into the health care system. Nestlé had been criticized by campaigners for its aggressive marketing of its formula baby milk in the “developing” world, where formula milk powder often has dirty water added to it to make it into milk, which then makes babies sick, sometimes with dire consequences. (ref: 25)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

Use of GM ingredients in food products (September 2009)

In September 2009 Ethical Consumer searched the Nestlé SA website, www.nestle.com, for references to the company’s policy on the use of genetically engineered ingredients. The statement “Beyond Corporate Image: The Search for Trust” was found, which included relevant references. It was stated that “If we have a positive public stand which supports careful use of gene technology, it is because vis-à-vis the enormous challenge of continuing to supply an ever growing population and, at the same time, diminish the unsustainable negative environmental impact of our present agricultural system, we recognize that the responsible research and application of gene technology could become a solution to this extremely important issue... Where the scientific community, through health and environmental authorities, has approved and verified the safety of genetically modified raw materials, and where they are accepted by the consumers, Nestlé will keep on using them. Simultaneously, we assure that all products and their ingredients sold by Nestlé,

undergo beforehand our stringent internal safety control and, where adequate, are openly and clearly declared.” (ref: 26)

Boycott Call

(See also ‘Boycott over baby milk marketing’ in Irresponsible Marketing above.)

(See also ‘Boycott call by Uncaged for animal testing’ in Animal Testing above.)

Criticism of Fairtrade coffee (October 2005)

According to an article on the Baby Milk Action website, www.babymilkaction.org, dated October 2005, Nestlé’s Fairtrade coffee had gone straight onto the organisation’s boycott list because of the company’s baby food marketing malpractice. The article advised people who want their shopping to help people in developing countries try products from genuine Fair Trade companies and not to be duped by Nestlé’s attempted diversion. The article stated that according to Nestlé’s press release, the coffee in its Partners’ Blend was sourced from 200 farmers in El Salvador and an undisclosed number working in a cooperative in Ethiopia. The article said that even if 3,000 farmers were involved, this was less than 0.1% of the farmers supplying Nestlé. Therefore virtually 100% of Nestlé’s coffee suppliers remained outside the Fairtrade system. The volume of coffee involved was estimated at just 0.02% of that which Nestlé purchases. The article went on to say that according to a researcher with the Colombian Food Workers’ Union, 150,000 coffee-farming families had lost their livelihoods due to Nestlé’s policies, he labelled the Fairtrade product ‘a big joke’. (ref: 27)

Political Activities

Member of industry association barred from WHO (February 2006)

According to an article from the Environment News Service, dated 2nd February 2006, posted on www.corpwatch.org, the World Health Organization (WHO) had barred life sciences industry association International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI), of which Nestlé was a member, over concerns that its members had a financial stake in the outcome of setting global standards protecting food and water supplies. According to the article, ILSI had funded WHO research that found no direct link between sugar consumption and obesity, had tried to avoid stronger curbs on toxic pollutants, and tried to discredit a possible link between perfluorochemicals and cancer. (ref: 28)

Jollies for UK MPs (2005)

According to the December 2005 issue of Baby Milk Action Update, in 2005 Nestlé had paid for a number of trips for British MPs. This included:

- tickets for Wimbledon to the local MP for the Buxton area, where Nestlé’s mineral water spring was sited;
- a delegation of MPs paid for by Nestlé to go to South Africa to see the company’s social and education projects. The MPs sent were said to include a government whip. Nestlé was said at the time to be opposing the South African government’s attempts to enforce the International Code on the marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes. It was also said to be lobbying British MPs in opposition to the proposed Children’s Food Bill, which would limit junk food marketing aimed at children. (ref: 29)

Member of USCIB lobby group (2007)

The website of the US Council for International Business (www.uscib.org) in July 2007 listed Nestlé USA as a member. The USCIB described itself as “founded in 1945 to promote an open world trading system, now among the premier pro-trade, pro-market liberalization organizations ...provides unparalleled access to international policy makers and regulatory authorities.” ECRA noted that free trade lobby groups had been criticised by campaigners for lobbying for business interests at the expense of the environment, human rights and animal welfare. (ref: 30)

Anti-Social Finance

Operations in seven tax havens (2008)

According to the Nestle Annual Report 2008, downloaded from the company website, www.nestle.com, in April 2009, the company had operations in the following countries: Bahrain, Guatemala, Ireland, Panama, Philippines, Singapore, and Uruguay. All of these countries were on Ethical Consumer's list of tax havens at the time of writing. (ref: 31)

Excessive executive pay (2007)

According to an article on the website, www.swissinfo.ch, dated 23rd September 2008, and entitled 'Pension funds insist on executive pay vote', the top Swiss earners in 2007 included Nestlé CEO Peter Brabeck who earned 18.7 million Swiss Francs, equivalent to £11,169,346 million. Ethical Consumer deemed sums over £1million to be excessive. (ref: 32)

Concerns over union busting, exploitation of farmers and marketing (2006)

According to Baby Milk Action Updates 38, September 2006, concerns had been raised by their organisation over union busting in Colombia, exploitation of coffee and dairy farmers and Nestlé's baby food marketing. Baby Milk Action called for binding regulations rather than voluntary measures. Nestlé auditors, Bureau Veritas, admitted that Nestlé required them to use its discredited interpretation of the marketing requirements instead of the World Health Assembly Resolutions. (ref: 25)

Asda Cat Food

Owned by Asda Group Ltd

Asda Group Ltd, Corporate Social Responsibility, Asda, ASDA House, Southbank, Great Wilson Street, Leeds, LS11 5AD, England

Asda Group Ltd is owned by Wal-Mart Stores Inc

Wal-Mart Stores Inc, PO Box 1039, Bentonville, Arkansas, 72716-8611, USA

Wal-Mart Stores Inc also owns Asda Dog Food

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for environmental report (August 2008)

In May/June 2009, ECRA contacted Asda and a copy of the company's environment report was requested. The company did not respond. On 8th July 2009, a search of the company website was made. Under the section "Sustainability", information about the company's environmental activities was found. The section contained at least 2 future, dated, quantified targets. No evidence of independent verification of the section could be found. The website had a copyright date of 2008 and the section text appeared to be current. No mention of the issue of the business being dependent, at the time of writing, on customer car use, could be found. Although the section covered several environmental aspects, there was no mention of pesticides and other agricultural impacts that occur as a result of producing goods for the company, therefore the company was not deemed to have a reasonable understanding of the main environmental impacts of its business. The company was given ECRA's middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 33)

Poor independent rating on CSR in supermarkets (November 2006)

Ethical Performance November 2006 reported that Asda received a poor rating (rated as a 'D') in a report by the National Consumer Council on supermarkets' progress on corporate responsibility. The rating covered supermarkets progress on CSR factors including: commitment to stocking seasonal food and organics, sustainable

sourcing policies and attempts at cutting waste. (ref: 34)

Climate Change

No palm oil policy (July 2009)

A search was made of the Walmart website (www.walmartstores.com) on 8th July 2009. No policy on palm oil could be found. Walmart received negative marks for climate change, impact on endangered species and habitat destruction, which were all results of unsustainable palm oil production. Palm oil is used in a vast array of consumer products. (ref: 35)

Use of non Certified Sustainable Palm Oil (July 2009)

In May/June 2009, ECRA contacted Asda and asked the company about its palm oil policy. The company did not reply to the questionnaire. A search was made of the company website (www.about-asda.com) on 8th July 2009. The site stated that the company was a member of the RSPO, and that in 2007 Asda had pledged to not take any palm oil from Indonesia or Sumatra by the end of 2008. It did not state if it had fulfilled the pledge and the website had a copyright date of 2008. As campaigners had also highlighted problems with palm oil from Malaysia, Asda still received negative marks for impacts on climate change, endangered species (orang-utan) and habitat destruction. (ref: 33)

Policy on stocking local produce (October 2008)

Wal-Mart did not respond to a request made by ECRA in October 2008 for details on its policy towards stocking locally produced food. ECRA searched the company's website (www.walmartstores.com) in November 2008 and found a page entitled 'Locally Grown Products', which stated that Wal-Mart noted that buying locally grown produce was "a hot marketplace trend". However, no figures were given for the percentage of Wal-Mart's sales accounted for by local produce. ECRA also downloaded a document with the title "Wal-Mart makes national commitment to buy locally grown produce", but again, this contained no figures for sales and set no targets to increase sales of local produce. ECRA did not consider that this constituted a real commitment to encouraging sales of locally produced products, and as a result the company received a negative mark in this category. It had been noted by environmental campaigners that the issue of 'food miles' - the distance travelled by a product from supplier to consumer - had been a contributor to carbon emissions which had a damaging effect on the environment. (ref: 36)

Pollution & Toxics

Sold children's clothes coated with Teflon (May 2007)

The ASDA website was visited in May 2007 and was found to be selling children's clothes coated with Teflon. Chemicals such as Teflon, belonging to the "non-stick" family of perfluorinated chemicals (PFCs) had been classified as cancer-causing by the US Environmental Protection Agency and had been found in a wide range of species including polar bears, dolphins and humans worldwide. Environmental campaigners had called for PFCs to be replaced with safer alternatives especially in clothing and other consumer products. PFCs such as Teflon were used in many school trousers and skirts to give them durability and are frequently labelled "non-iron". (ref: 37)

Shareholder resolution on safer chemicals (February 2006)

Socialfunds.com reported on 9 February 2006 that Wal-Mart had had a shareholder resolution introduced asking the company to report on its safer chemicals policies. (ref: 38)

Chinese stores blacklisted over child clothing safety (2006)

According to the 14th June 2006 issue of CSR Asia Weekly, in 2006 the industry and commerce administration bureau in the Chinese province of Guangdong had carried out tests on children's clothing from a number of brands and stores. Wal-Mart was one of the stores which was said to have been blacklisted by the administration as a result of the tests, which were said to have shown that a large number of items of children's clothes

contained formaldehyde, a chemical said to be a respiratory irritant, a sensitiser for other chemicals and, if inhaled in a large doses, a carcinogen. (ref: 39)

Habitats & Resources

(See also 'Use of non Certified Sustainable Palm Oil' in Climate Change above.)

(See also 'No palm oil policy' in Climate Change above.)

Animals

Animal Testing

Worst ECRA rating for animal testing policy (September 2009)

According to the FAQ section of the ASDA website, www.asda.co.uk, viewed on 4th September 2009, ASDA was against animal testing the website stated "ASDA is against animal testing and funds research into alternatives." However it did not state how this was implemented i.e. through a fixed cut-off date or five year rolling rule and the company did not supply any additional relevant information. ASDA was also not endorsed in the 2008 Naturewatch Compassionate Shopping Guide. In addition the company sold branded cosmetics, toiletries, medicines and household products made by companies which were actively testing their products on animals. ASDA received ECRA's worst rating for animal testing policy. (ref: 41)

Worst ECRA rating for animal testing policy (August 2005)

Wal-Mart did not respond to a request from ECRA made in August 2005 for details of its policy on stocking cosmetic and/or household products which had been tested on animals. No such policy was found on the company's website (www.walmartstores.com) during a search in August 2005. It was assumed by ECRA that therefore, the company sold cosmetic and household products which had been tested on animals. (ref: 42)

Criticism of animal testing policy (2005)

According to the summer 2005 issue of BUAV Campaign Report, ASDA had informed BUAV that it did not conduct or commission animal tests for its own brand household products, but that it did not operate a fixed cut off date, which BUAV stated meant that the company could still be buying in products recently tested on animals. (ref: 43)

Factory farming

(See also 'Sale of beef causing Amazonian deforestation' in Habitats & Resources above.)

Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic (2008)

Wal-Mart did not respond to a request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company's animal welfare policy. No such policy, nor any commitment to stocking organic or free range meat, poultry or eggs could be found on the company's website (www.walmartstores.com) when it was viewed in November 2008. As a result, ECRA considered it likely that the company was selling meat products from factory farmed animals. (ref: 36)

Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic (2008)

In response to a request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company's animal welfare policy, Asda sent the same statement that appeared on its website (www.about-asda.com). This stated that the company supported the Red Tractor scheme to promote animal welfare and that it had also "established a number of initiatives to improve animal welfare," one of which it named as the 360 Sustainable Dairy Calf Scheme. However, the company did not state that all meat products it sold were labelled as free range or organic, nor could this information be found on the company's website (www.about-asda.com), which apparently made no mention of free range meat when it was viewed by ECRA in November 2008. As a result, ECRA considered it likely that some of the meat sold by the company had come from factory farmed animals. (ref: 44)

Animal Rights

Sale of slaughterhouse by-products (2008)

During a search of the company's website (www.asda.co.uk) in November 2008, ECRA found that Asda sold a range of own-brand products including ready meals such as pizza and breaded meat and fish products as well as desserts. ECRA considered it likely that some of these products contained slaughterhouse by-products including rennet, animal fat and gelatine. (ref: 45)

(See also 'Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic' in Factory farming above.)

People

Human Rights

Conflict Diamond Survey Results (May 2007)

In May 2007 Amnesty International and Global Witness released a report entitled "Conflict Diamonds, UK jewellery retailers still not doing enough." Asda were mentioned in this report.

The report was based on findings from a questionnaire sent to leading retailers. The report stated that "although most companies adhere to the industry's minimal system of self regulation, these are not effective in preventing the trade in blood diamonds, and more needs to be done by industry leaders to ensure that diamonds no longer fuel conflict." Asda itself failed to disclose its auditing policy and other measures taken to combat conflict diamonds. It had no policy on its company website and it was not a member of any jewellery trade associations. (ref: 46)

Dropped from Norwegian pension fund (2006)

According to issue 71 (November 2006) of Indonesia's Down to Earth magazine, Norway had announced that it was dropping Wal-Mart Stores from its Government Pension Fund for "serious, systematic violations of human rights and labour rights". (ref: 48)

Workers' Rights

Death of security guard during stampede (November 2008)

According to an article on the Reuters website (www.reuters.com), dated 6 May 2009, a security guard employed by Wal-Mart was trampled to death in a stampede that occurred at the Wal-Mart store he was working at, on the Friday after Thanksgiving in 2008.

The company was said to have avoided a criminal prosecution by committing to improve post-Thanksgiving crowd control. This particular time of year was said to be well-known as a very busy time for retailers. According to the article, the company "did not admit guilt or wrongdoing". The crowd control measures were said to only apply to New York stores. The worker's family was said to have taken out a separate civil lawsuit. (ref: 49)

Norwegian government pension fund highlights workers' rights abuses (2006)

According to a press release from the National Labor Committee dated 4 April 2007 the Norwegian government's pension fund, one of the largest in the world, had withdrawn investment in Wal-Mart due to "unacceptable risk that through its investments [it] may be complicit in serious or systematic violations of human rights." The Petroleum Fund's Council on Ethics reported in its 2006 Annual Report that Wal-Mart engaged in systematic abuses in its global supply chain, including: child labour; wages below local minimums; health-hazardous working conditions; unreasonable punishments; prohibition of unionisation and conditions bordering on forced labour. In the US the fund found Wal-Mart guilty of gender discrimination, active obstruction of the right to unionise, employment of minors, mandatory overtime without compensation and use of illegal labour. (ref: 50)

Poor workers rights at Chinese printing company supplier (18 August 2005)

A report on August 18th 2005 by the National Labour Committee provided more than 20 pages of detailed evidence into dangerous

and inadequate working conditions at three Hung Hing printing factories in China producing printed items for a range of western companies including Wal-Mart. They also provided evidence of mandatory overtime, 12-13 hour shifts, and inadequate wages. (ref: 51)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (2009)

In order to rate a company's supply chain policy (also referred to as code of conduct, code of practice, supplier policy and various other synonymous terms), ECRA needs to see a copy of the document that is communicated to workers. This is because workers have a right to know the conditions under which the buying companies are expecting them to work, so that the workers can use this information to press for improvements. At the time of writing, several ETI-member companies had not fully integrated the ETI Base Code and Principles of Implementation into their supply chain policies, and it had come to ECRA's attention that companies do not have to fulfil this criteria in order to gain membership of the ETI. Indeed, some members state that their policy is "aligned to"/"based on" the Base Code etc, but examination of the policy reveals that key points from the Base Code are missing.

In May/June 2009, Asda were contacted by ECRA and a copy of the company's supply chain policy was requested. The company did not respond to the request. The company website was searched (www.about-asda.com) on 8th July 2009. In the Ethical Trade section, the company stated that its code was "aligned" to the ETI Base Code but did not make its code available. Asda also stated that compliance with the code was monitored by Asda's own ethical trading managers, but did not mention if NGOs/trade unions or any other independent organisation was involved in this process.

Given what is said above, ECRA could not rate the company without seeing the information communicated to workers. Therefore, the company received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy (ref: 33)

Multiple references from Labour Behind the Label report (September 2006)

Labour Behind the Label (LBL): Let's Clean Up Fashion report (September 2006) reported several criticisms of the company they referred to as Asda/Walmart. LBL summed up its analysis by asserting that "As the world's biggest retailer, Asda should be leading the field" but instead was "more interested in ticking the right boxes...than they are in achieving actual results for their workers". This was in reference to Asda/Walmart's membership of the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI), Better Factories Initiative and the Multi-Fibre Agreement Forum, but lack of progress on the ground.

The company's compliance manager stated that the living wage specified in the ETI Base Code could not be put into practice as there is no "clear universal definition" of what a living wage is. LBL stated that this assertion is "untenable". The manager believed that setting a living wage was the responsibility of governments. LBL stated that as a major importer, the company had an indirect impact on national minimum wages. The ETI code stated that member companies should respect the right to Freedom of Association. The company stated that it is the factory managers' and suppliers' responsibility to do this. LBL criticised this as a conflict of interest, as the same people are also responsible for delivering cost reductions etc. LBL also stated that Asda (UK) was fined £850,000 around the time of the report for anti-union activity and that its response to the Fortune Cambodia case was poor. Asda/Walmart was also criticised for relying on commercial auditors in its monitoring and verification procedures and not seeming to involve local stakeholders enough. (ref: 52)

Member of the ETI (2008)

According to the Ethical Trading Initiative website (www.ethicaltrade.org), viewed by ECRA in November 2008, Asda was listed as a member. For companies to be accepted as members, they were required to adopt the ETI Base Code of Conduct and implement it into their supply chains. Progress reports on code implementation, and on improvements to labour practices were required. (ref: 53)

According to the Baby Feeding Law Group's (BFLG) website viewed by ECRA in September 2006 (www.babyfeedinglawgroup.org.uk), Asda had breached the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes through its 'Roll-back' promotion of Milupa's Aptamil First infant milk substitute in June 2006. Consequently, Asda was reported to the UK's Trading Standards by the BFLG. (ref: 54)

Irresponsible Marketing

UK violations of baby milk Code (September 2006)

According to the Baby Feeding Law Group's (BFLG) website viewed by ECRA in September 2006 (www.babyfeedinglawgroup.org.uk), Asda had breached the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes through its 'Roll-back' promotion of Milupa's Aptamil First infant milk substitute in June 2006. Consequently, Asda was reported to the UK's Trading Standards by the BFLG. (ref: 54)

Named in tobacco price fixing allegation (2008)

According to the Sky News Website on Monday 28th April, 2008 (viewed by ECRA on 08/05/2008) eleven leading supermarkets, including Asda, were named in a report on tobacco price fixing by the Office of Fair Trading. The OFT had been investigating alleged deals between two tobacco firms - Imperial Tobacco and Gallher - and 11 retailers. The claims related to the alleged collusion of the eleven firms on the wholesale price of cigarettes and the gap in retail prices between different brands. The offences spanned a three year period from 2000. John Fingleton, chief executive of the OFT said "if proven, the alleged practices would amount to a serious breach of the law." Sky business correspondent Joel Hills said: "Imperial Tobacco and Gallaher account for over 80% of the cigarette market in the UK. (ref: 55)

Irresponsible marketing of dairy products to children (March 2009)

In March 2009 The Food Magazine reported that Asda was one of a number of companies that had paid for the heavily branded "3-a-day Dairy Bus", which was being introduced around the UK during 2009, with visits to schools and country fairs. "3-a-day" referred to milk, yoghurt and cheese. A visit to the bus was said to teach children about where dairy products come from, how they are processed, and why they are good as part of a balanced diet. The article noted that it was unlikely children would receive lessons about the high saturated fat and/or sugar content of some of the products made by the sponsoring companies, and that the bus enabled companies to by-pass Ofcom restrictions that would have been in place for some of their products if they were advertised on television, due to them being high in sugar, fat and/or salt. (ref: 15)

Arms & Military Supply

Armaments stockist (2006)

According to the Wal-Mart company website www.walmart.com/catalog, viewed by ECRA in May 2006, Wal-Mart sold a range of guns, including rifles, shotguns and muzzleloaders. (ref: 56)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No effective policy on GM cotton (January 2009)

In December 2008 Ethical Consumer emailed ASDA with a questionnaire that included a request for information about the company's policy regarding GM cotton. The company responded that it was "never knowingly used". The January 2006 issue of Ethical Consumer stated that: "According to UNCTAD, cotton grown from genetically modified crops currently accounts for around 35% of the global market." Therefore, in the absence of a clear, company wide policy that GM cotton was actively avoided, it was assumed that ASDA was likely to be selling cotton products manufactured from GM cotton. (ref: 57)

GM policy for company's own products only (July 2009)

A questionnaire was sent to The ASDA Group Ltd by ECRA in May/June 2009, which included a question regarding the company's policy on genetic modification. The company did not respond. The company's website (www.about-asda.com) was searched in July 2009. The section of the company's website entitled 'Genetic Modification' stated that none of the company's products contained Genetically Modified (GM) ingredients or derivatives. However, no mention was made of whether or not the company sold branded products that contained genetically modified ingredients, nor whether it allowed the use of GM ingredients in animal feed. As a result, ECRA considered it likely that some animal products and non-own-brand products sold by the company had been produced with GM ingredients or come from animals fed GM feed. (ref: 33)

No genetic engineering policy (July 2009)

Wal-Mart did not respond to a request from ECRA in May/June 2009 as to whether the company had a policy prohibiting the use of genetically modified (GM) ingredients in its own-label products. As no such information was found on the company's website (www.walmartstores.com) in July 2009, ECRA considered it likely that the company sold products containing ingredients from animals fed GM feed, as GM animal feed was prevalent in supply chains. The company sold a very wide range of own brand and non-own brand consumer products. (ref: 35)

Boycott Call

Boycott of whole company group (July 2009)

The Feeling Blue Seeing Red website was checked on 23rd July 2009. The organisation was still calling for a boycott of Wal-Mart. It stated that "Boycotting Wal-Mart, Wal-Mart and Sam's Club's transgressions of local, state and U. S. laws, anti-union activities, support of overseas sweat shops, and adjusting its retail philosophy to accord with social conservative priorities all suggest that a single target issue for a boycott would be inappropriate. For now, just don't shop there." (ref: 58)

Political Activities

Lobbying against planning regulations (2005)

According to a report published by War on Want in September 2005, Wal-Mart's aversion to community planning led it to take out an ill-advised newspaper ad as part of a campaign against a ballot proposal to limit the expansion of the company in Arizona. The advert pictured a group of Nazi stormtroopers burning a heap of books and asked: "Should we let government tell us what we can read? Of course not... So why should we allow local government to limit where we shop?" The ballot proposal came about after concerns were raised about the high social, economic and environmental costs of having a Wal-Mart store in the area. (ref: 59)

WTO lobbying (2006)

According to the March 2006 edition of the Ecologist, Wal-Mart and other companies dominated the US Trade Policy Advisory Committees. The article on the privileged access that multinational companies have over policy making at the World Trade Organisation (WTO), claimed that the 742 external advisors to the US trade department had access to confidential WTO negotiating documents, and attended meetings with US trade negotiators. 93% of these were said to represent business lobby groups and corporations. The article alleged that the 17,000 lobbyists in Washington DC outnumbered lawmakers in US Congress and federal officials by 30 to one. It also said that corporations and lobby groups spent nearly \$13 billion influencing Congress and federal officials from 1998-2004. The article claimed that tariff cuts brought about by trade liberalisation, had reduced Majority World countries' income from import taxes by up to \$60 billion per year. This was because cheap imports flooded Majority World countries markets, leaving farmers unable to sell their products and forcing local factories to shut down. (ref: 60)

Fined for child labour law violations, and then reached 'unusual' agreement over labour inspections (1 November 2005)

An article in Occupational Hazards (www.occupationalhazards.com), a USA Health and Safety website in November 2005, cited that Wal Mart had been fined for child labour law violations in three states. It was accused of allowing 16 and 17 year old employees in Arkansas, Connecticut and New Hampshire to operate potentially dangerous heavy machinery. However, under the terms of a special agreement reached with the US government's Wage Hour Division (WHD) agency, the company was fined \$135,540 but not required to admit any wrongdoing. This special agreement reached by Wal Marts lawyers and the WHD, consisted of various protocols, including that the WHD should give 15 days advance notice to Wal-Mart if it were to be inspected for child labour law violations. Giving advance notice of an inspection was in fact against the WHD's own operational guidelines. Another provision of the special agreement was that Wal Mart would not be fined in future for child labour violations as long as the retailer came into compliance with the law 10 days after formal notice of the violation. (ref: 61)

Anti-Social Finance

(See also 'WTO lobbying' in Political Activities above.)

Lawsuit filed over alleged executives' misconduct (May 2007)

According to an article in The Guardian newspaper dated 28 May 2007, a former senior employee of Wal-Mart had filed a lawsuit in Detroit (US), which accused a number of company executives of 'accepting gifts and discounts on items such as yachts and diamonds from suppliers and other businesses'. The former employee who launched this legal action was fired from the company in December 2006 over allegations of misusing corporate funds, and accepting gifts from an advertising company that was later hired by Wal Mart. (ref: 62)

Poor conditions in South African supplier farms (February 2009)

The War on Want report 'Sour Grapes: South African wine workers and British supermarket power', published in February 2009, stated that the UK government's Competition Commission report of April 2008 found that "supermarkets have used their buying power to squeeze suppliers by transferring risk and costs onto them". Suppliers were reported to be hesitant to speak out against supermarkets in case they were removed from the supermarket's list of suppliers.

Specific problems noted in relation to South African producers were the fact that it was rare for suppliers to have formal contracts, leading to the potential of being de-listed at short notice; supermarkets changing their costs and prices as they liked to suit their needs, and last minute order cancellations without compensation. South African producers were said not to receive assured prices, so there was no guarantee that they could cover their costs. Delays in payment for orders were said to be common, with 120-day long delays becoming increasingly so. Discounts offered by supermarkets were said to be often passed on to suppliers, through pressure to 'promote' the products. Supermarkets were also said to charge for good positioning on the shelf: from £15,000 to £100,000. In addition, it was stated that supermarkets often press suppliers to enter into exclusivity agreements with them, so that the suppliers were entirely dependent on one customer.

The report claimed that "it is the South African workers who pay the price for UK supermarket power and greed." Issues related to this were said to be: sacking workers; lack of formal employment contracts and low wages. The trend towards employing seasonal workers who had no benefits was said to be increasing: in 1995 the ratio of seasonal workers to permanent workers was about

equal; by 2000 it was 65%:35%. This was said to reduce the ability of the workers to organise. Women were said to be more vulnerable as a result of the worsening working conditions of workers, to be paid lower wages than men, and to be frequently subjected to sexual harassment at work.

ASDA was named as one of the largest importers of South African wine, with a 9% share of all sales. (ref: 63)

Burns Cat Food

Owned by Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd

BurnsPetNutritionLtd, 4AvalonCourt,, Kidnelly, Carmarthenshire, SA17 5EJ, Wales

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environment (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer searched the Burns Pet Nutrition website, www.burnspet.co.uk, for the company's environmental policy or report in January 2010. A page on the environment was found which showed that the company had some commitment to reducing its environmental impact. However as a pet food supplier it did not show a reasonable understanding of its impact as it made no mention of the impact of meat and other agriculture on the environment. There was no proper reporting on past performance and no targets for future improvement so the company was awarded Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 64)

Animals

Factory farming

Sale of both free-range and non-free range meat (January 2010)

According to the Burn Pet Nutrition company questionnaire response received by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 the company did not use caged chickens in its foods and its fish was from sustainable sources. The company tried to source the meat from the UK. Currently this is only with the exception of its venison meal, in which some of the fish is from outside the UK. However according to the website the company also sold UK pork. Pork is commonly factory farmed in the UK. A conversation with a company spokesperson stated that the company specified to suppliers that all meat must be from non-intensive sources but this was no guarantee that the meat was free range. (ref: 65)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of both free-range and non-free range meat' in Factory farming above.)

Encouraging pet breeding (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer found the following on the Burns pet nutrition website, www.burnspet.co.uk, in January 2010: 'Are you a breeder currently using Burns Real Food? Are you a breeder considering using Burns Real Food? Would you be interested in promoting its use to your customers? If so, then we'd like to hear from you, because we've got a very attractive breeder scheme which we'd like to share with you. Burns offer breeder schemes for both kitten and puppy breeders. The schemes are offered free of charge to all breeders who are feeding Burns bought either through a stockist or by direct purchase. Registration is generally via contact with us here at Kidwelly but could be arranged via a stockist. The intention is that the breeder scheme operates as a complimentary service that will benefit all Burns customers and stockists.' Given that many cats and dogs are put down every week due to a lack of available homes and animal rescue centres struggle with the sheer numbers of unwanted animals it was considered irresponsible of Burns to be encouraging pet breeding in this way.

It was noted however that the company also made charitable donations to a number of animal rescue organisations. (ref: 64)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Supply chain policy (January 2010)

According to the Burn Pet Nutrition company questionnaire response received by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 the company used fair trade products (such as tea, coffee, sugar) in its offices and tried to source ingredients as ethically as possible but we had no policy regarding this currently. (ref: 65)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

Policy on GM (January 2010)

According to the Burn Pet Nutrition company questionnaire response received by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 the company did not use GM products in its foods or any nanotechnologies. However the response did not refer to animal feed or animal products. As the company sold pet food containing meat it was likely that, in the absence of a more explicit policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 65)

Butcher's Dog Food

Owned by Butcher's Petcare Ltd

Butcher's Petcare Ltd is owned by FW Baker Ltd

FW Baker Ltd, Marketing, Baker Group House, Crick, Northampton, NN6 7TZ

FW Baker Ltd also owns Classic cat food

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environmental report (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer found Butcher's Petcare Ltd's Ethical Policy on the company website, www.butcherspetcare.com, when searched in January 2010. It contained a few points on packaging: it recycled used packaging materials, the paper and card on finished products was made from recyclable materials where possible, and its cans were made from recyclable steel. It also contained a paragraph which stated that it strived to reduce its environmental impact, and had developed procedures for raw materials and packaging to minimise its environmental impact. It did not include quantified data on past performance, or targets for future improvement. (ref: 66)

Animals

Factory farming

Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic (January 2010)

Butchers Petcare's range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.butcherspetcare.com, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, were based solely on meat which did not appear to be organic or free range. (ref: 67)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic')

in Factory farming above.)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Butchers Petcare website, www.butcherspetcare.com, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 67)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No GM policy on company website (January 2010)

There was no GM policy apparent on the Bakers Petcare website, www.bakerspetcare.com, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. Although the company said it was the only main brand of dog food that didn't contain any cereal, soya or gluten, it was likely that, in the absence of such a policy, the company was selling meat from animals fed GM crops. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 67)

Cesar Dog Food

Owned by Mars Petcare UK Ltd

Mars Petcare UK Ltd, Corporate Affairs, Mars, Freeby Lane, Waltham on the Wolds, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE14 4RT

Mars Petcare UK Ltd is owned by Mars UK Ltd

owned by Mars Inc

Mars Inc, 6885 Elm Street, McLean, Va 22101, USA

Mars UK Ltd also owns Chappie Dog Food and Kitekat Cat Food and Pedigree dog food and Sheba Cat Food and Whiskas Cat Food and Whiskas Organic Cat Food [O]

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for environmental reporting (November 2009)

Mars responded to an Ethical Consumer questionnaire in November 2009. When asked about environmental reporting it provided a link to its global sustainability policy dated 2007. This contained a section entitled 'Sustainability and The Five Principles', dated 2007, which were said to be quality, responsibility, mutuality, efficiency and freedom. It did not contain any dated, quantified future targets for reducing the company's environmental impact; did not demonstrate a reasonable understanding of the company's environmental impacts and no mention was made of independent verification of environmental data. The document was so vague that it could not be considered to be an environmental policy.

In addition the response contained the following statement 'The Mars focus is on areas where we believe we can make the biggest difference for the well-being of our business, people and the planet. We're proud to have a five-point plan that shows our commitment to the planet – waste, water, transport, energy and packaging. We have worked with a diverse range of partners, including the Food and Drink Federation, the Carbon Trust, ENVIROS and WRAP, to set ambitious goals in each of these areas. These goals complement our participation in the Courtauld Commitment, The

Prince's May Day Network, the Federation House Commitment, and the FDF five-fold commitment. Our position will help us to lead our industry and demonstrate to others how global business can be at the fore of sustainable innovation. Some of our key targets are as follows: To cut transport CO2 emissions by 30% by 2020, to reduce water usage by 20% by 2020, to cut energy CO2 emissions by 20% by 2020, to have zero factory waste to landfill by 2011, to reduce packaging by 10% by 2010.

There were also more detailed explanations of how the company had already gone some way to achieving these goals. This demonstrated that the company had a reasonable understanding of some of its environmental impacts, however there was no mention of agricultural environmental impacts, as a food manufacturer the information did show a full understanding of the company's environmental impacts. There was no detailed reporting on past environmental performance against key performance indicators, which Ethical Consumer would expect from a company of this size. Ethical Consumer would expect this information to be included in a formal, independently verified environmental report, published at least every two years.

However, the company had made progress in terms of its environmental reporting since it was last updated by Ethical Consumer and the fact that it had set quantified future targets for reducing its environmental impacts meant it was awarded Ethical Consumer's middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 68)

Climate Change

Use of palm oil not certified as from sustainable sources (November 2009)

In November 2009 Mars UK returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding the use of palm oil, it was stated that the company only used palm oil suppliers that were members of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). The company was said to be aiming to move towards 100% RSPO certified palm oil by 2015. Due to the fact that at the time of writing the company was using palm oil from sources not certified as sustainable, the company lost marks in the categories of climate change, habitat destruction and endangered species. Supplier membership of the RSPO was not considered by Ethical Consumer to be sufficient to guarantee that the palm oil the company used was produced in a sustainable way. (ref: 68)

Fine for carbon allowance shortfall (2006)

According to the December 2006 issue of ENDS Report, in 2006 Masterfoods had been fined £759,000 after it was found that the company had failed to submit enough carbon emissions allowances from the EU Emissions Trading Scheme to cover its carbon emissions. (ref: 69)

Habitats & Resources

(See also 'Use of palm oil not certified as from sustainable sources' in Climate Change above.)

Positive policy on sale of fish (November 2009)

Mars' response to an Ethical Consumer questionnaire in November 2009 included the company's policy on fish sourcing which stated that Mars ensures that it did not source fish from endangered populations, areas of localised scarcity and areas of heavy metal contamination. It went on to say 'Mars Petcare Europe, has always been committed to the sustainable use of raw materials and we comply with all laws regulating this subject. Given the growing concerns about the use of endangered species of fish and fish caught in over-fished areas of the sea, we are phasing out use of all fish species which are listed as Endangered or Vulnerable by the IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) or switching to sustainable sources for those

species. All pet food varieties produced in Europe or imported from other regions comply with this policy. As a result we have withdrawn the Big Eye Tuna in 2008, the most endangered Tuna species on the IUCN list, from our specifications. In addition there is a level of public concern regarding sustainability of Blue Fin Tuna & Swordfish. We have already withdrawn Blue Fin Tuna from our recipes and also decided to take out Swordfish from our entire European petfood portfolio as soon as possible. Sheba Pouch with Swordfish has been changed as of end of June 2009 into Trout variety. We support EU legal efforts regarding fish traceability, and we ask our suppliers to respect fish sustainability concerns, and to be transparent regarding fish species and fishing methods. For example, we require all of our suppliers to use only dolphin friendly fishing methods and have done so for many years.’ However this policy implied that the company was still sourcing fish species labelled as endangered or vulnerable by the IUCN therefore Mars Petcare UK receives a negative mark in the habitats and resources category for unsustainable fishing. (ref: 68)

Animals

Animal Testing

Boycott call by Uncaged for animal testing (January 2010)

Many brands made by Mars Petcare UK were listed on the Uncaged website’s petfood and animal testing page under the ‘brands to boycott’ section as these products were tested on animals. (ref: 10)

Non-invasive animal testing (November 2009)

In November 2009 Mars Petcare UK returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding animal testing the company stated the following: ‘The Waltham Centre for Pet Nutrition is the hub site for the global research activities of Mars Petcare. We do not carry out any harmful animal testing and we practice pet friendly ‘Caring Science’ at all times – an approach that

constantly strives to look after our pets in conditions just like those in a lovely family home. By developing products that constantly improve nutrition and care, we help the world’s pets to live healthier and happier lives. In collaboration with global scientific institutes, our unique team of carers, scientists and research staff at Waltham supports leading Mars brands. We work with dogs, cats, birds, fish and horses to pioneer some of the most important breakthroughs in pet nutrition and share these research results with the scientific and pet care communities and more than 1,600

publications.’ However, according to the BUAV this is nevertheless unacceptable ‘In many cases, the dogs in question are kennelled for substantial portions of, if not all their lives. For social and domesticated animals like these, such conditions are inappropriate and they may not provide adequate mental, physical or social stimulation. We know through various studies that the housing conditions of animals can have a substantial effect, not only on their well-being, but also on their physiological functions, such as the immune system. These effects may tend to render suspicious any results, nutritional or other, that come from such studies.’ (ref: 68)

Company tests on animals (June 2008)

According to the Mars Inc website, www.mars.com, viewed by ECRA in June 2008, the company had two businesses which used animal testing as part of the development of their products. One company produced, among other things (which were un-named) pharmaceutical ingredients. The animal testing it undertook involved rats and mice. The other business developed pharmaceuticals and water treatments for fish and other small aquatic species. (ref: 70)

Factory farming

Sale of meat not specified as free range (November 2009)

Mars Petcare UK Ltd’s response to an Ethical Consumer questionnaire in November 2009 stated the following: We only use British meat in all of our Pedigree products, and our Good Honest Food (GHF) programme (see below for more information on GHF) means that we can trace the meat used in Pedigree products back to the farms where the animals were reared. Our overriding concern is to manufacture and sell products which satisfy our consumers and their pets while meeting

the highest standards of quality and safety. To ensure this, we have stringent quality assurance procedures in place which govern all aspects of our manufacturing process and we only use ingredients which comply with all legislative and regulatory requirements. Our UK suppliers are members of assurance bodies such as the Assured Chicken Production Scheme and Red Tractor Scheme. However this was no guarantee that the company did not sell factory farmed meat and in fact the Red Tractor scheme includes factory farms so it was assumed Mars Petcare sourced non-free range meat. (ref: 68)

Plans to replace battery farmed eggs with barn eggs (August 2009)

In August 2009 Mars Chocolate UK returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding animal welfare, it was stated that in the company’s snackfood products, it was in the process of moving from using eggs from battery hens to using eggs produced by barn-kept hens. In France and the UK the company was said to have switched to barn eggs in January 2008. However, in other countries the company was using battery farmed eggs at the time of writing. (ref: 71)

Animal Rights

(See also ‘Positive policy on sale of fish’ in **Habitats & Resources** above.)

(See also ‘Sale of meat not specified as free range’ in **Factory farming** above.)

Products contained unexpected animal derived ingredients (March 2009)

In March 2009 The Food Magazine reported that Bounty and Twix bars contained whey produced using animal-derived rennet, but that Mars, the company that produced them, did not state on the ingredients list that it was from non-vegetarian sources. The article also stated that M & M’s contained cochineal, which was made from crushed insects, but that the product was not labelled as ‘unsuitable for vegetarians’. (ref: 15)

People

Human Rights

(See also ‘Use of palm oil not certified as from sustainable sources’ in **Climate Change** above.)

Operations in eight oppressive regimes (June 2008)

According to the website of Mars Inc viewed by ECRA in June 2008 (www.mars.com), the company had operations in eight countries, which at the time of writing, ECRA considered to be governed by oppressive regimes: China, Egypt, Philippines, Russia, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, USA and Vietnam. (ref: 70)

Reluctance to set timetable to end child labour (May 2007)

According to the June 2007 edition of the Food Magazine, Mars was one of the companies represented by the UK Biscuit, Cake, Chocolate and Confectionery Association which in May 2007, admitted to UK MPs that the companies did not wish to set out a timetable to meet promises of child labour. The original deadline of 2005 had already been missed. (ref: 72)

Workers’ Rights

Stop the Traffik campaign against use of slave and child labour (2008)

According to The Food Magazine July/September 2007, anti-

Slavery campaigners Stop the Traffik (STT) had visited 22 schools at the start of a nationwide campaign that showed pupils that nearly half of the chocolate in their tuck shop comes from cocoa plantations that used slave labour.

The STT campaign was intended to highlight the plight of thousands of children in the Ivory Coast who were sold by traffickers to cocoa farmers. The children were then forced to harvest the crops that are bought by the British chocolate industry.

Campaigner Mandy Flashman was quoted as saying, "The school kids were shocked to hear that in the Ivory Coast children their age were forced to work on plantations, and would be beaten severely if they tried to escape." An International Labour Organisation report was said to have showed that an estimated 12,000 children had been trafficked into the Ivory Coast, enslaved on cocoa plantations and forced to work long hours. STT chairman Steve Chalke was quoted as saying "The big chocolate manufacturers are not doing enough to stop a slave trade which they are fully aware of." Nestlé, Mars and Cadbury were cited as the main offenders. (ref: 20)

(See also 'Reluctance to set timetable to end child labour' in Human Rights above.)

Age discrimination in Mexico (September 2007)

In September 2007 it was reported on the website USA today, www.usatoday.com, that discrimination of potential employees in Mexico was widespread. The article claimed that the Mexican authorities had admitted that they were lax on enforcing laws against age discrimination, and that the offenders were not just Mexican companies. Younger employees were said to be preferred due to the fact that they often lived with their families until they were married and therefore could live with much less income and cause fewer problems than older, married employees. Mars was said to have advertised for an assistant accountant between the ages of 20 and 30 for its pet food and chocolate division. (ref: 73)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst Ethical Consumer rating for supply chain policy (November 2009)

In November 2009 Mars UK returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding the company's policy addressing workers rights at supplier companies or any policies regarding sourcing, the company stated the following 'At Mars we believe that the standard by which our business relationships should be measured is the degree to which mutual benefits are created, and this is the starting point for any buying decisions. These benefits can take many different forms, and need not be strictly financial in nature. Likewise, while we must try to achieve the most competitive terms, the actions of Mars should never be at the expense, economic or otherwise, of others with whom we work. Mutuality – one of our Five Principles – has guided us reliably as we have established successful enterprises in new geographies and cultures. It has enabled us to act as a good corporate citizen, to minimise our impact on the environment and to use the natural resources of our planet wisely and efficiently.' A link was provided to a document available on the Mars Inc website entitled The Five Principles, which were said to be quality, responsibility, mutuality, efficiency and freedom. The document did not contain any of the clauses Ethical Consumer would expect to find in a supply chain policy, such as freedom of association, prohibiting the use of child labour, limitations of hours in the working week and payment of a living wage. Elsewhere on the website under a section entitled it stated that the company aimed to have its entire cocoa supply certified as sustainably produced the Rainforest Alliance by 2020. It also mentioned the Mars Partnership for African Cocoa Communities of Tomorrow (iMPACT) which it said addressed the environmental, economic and social needs of cocoa communities in a community-focused, collaborative and holistic way. Focused on the countries of Ghana

and Côte d'Ivoire, where 60 percent of the world's cocoa is produced, the iMPACT program, it said, was designed by taking the best practices from existing efforts in the region, and building on that work to create a robust program. It claimed iMPACT was already seeing results. With more than 26 communities in both Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire in the process of developing their own community action plans and also participating in training on better farming practices that they hope will show a direct correlation between the number of farmers trained and the increase in cocoa crop yields on their farms.

While this project may have been making a significant positive impact on those communities it engaged with, there was no policy in place to protect the rights of workers throughout the Mars supply chain. The company received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 68)

Irresponsible Marketing

Irresponsible marketing to children (March 2009)

In March 2009 The Food Magazine reported that a number of celebrities were used in advertising campaigns for foods that would have been banned from television advertising during programmes with a high proportion of young viewers, because they contained high levels of sugar, saturated fat, fat and/or salt. Mars Snickers was said to have been endorsed by Mr. T, which would have made the product appealing to children. (ref: 15)

Criticised for website marketing to children (2005)

According to the July 2005 issue of the Food Magazine, Mars was one of a number of manufacturers criticised for their use of websites to advertise sugary, fatty or salty foods to children. Companies were said to use tactics such as website games, email registration and repeat giveaways as methods of encouraging children to spend more time on websites for brands such as Skittles, and to make repeat visits, giving the companies opportunities to reinforce positive associations and brand information. (ref: 74)

(See also 'Products contained unexpected animal derived ingredients' in Animal Rights above.)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

Positive but inadequate GM policy (August 2009)

In August 2009 Mars Chocolate UK returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding the use of genetically engineered ingredients in products and the use of ingredients from animals fed on GM animal feed, the company stated that "Our ingredient specifications and quality assurance programs require that raw materials provided to us must be free from GM material." No specific mention of animal feed was made, and due to the fact that the company produced a number of products containing milk, and the prevalence of GM animal feed on the market, it was assumed that the company produced products containing ingredients derived from animals fed a GM diet. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. (ref: 71)

GMO policy does not exclude use of GMOs (October 2007)

In July 2009 ECRA downloaded the Mars Inc GMO Policy, dated October 2007, from the company website, www.mars.com. The document stated that "all the ingredients we use in our products comply with our own strict internal quality and safety requirements as well as all applicable laws and regulations...we aim to deliver products that match the different tastes, preferences and perceptions of consumers in different parts of the world." The document did not state that the company would avoid genetically modified ingredients in its products, or ingredients

from animals that had been fed genetically modified animal seed. Given the prevalence of such ingredients on the market, it was assumed that the company produced products containing such ingredients. (ref: 75)

Boycott Call

Boycott call over animal testing of chocolate (January 2010)

The PETA website, www.marscandykills.com, viewed on the 6th January 2010 was calling for a boycott of Mars for its funding of animal testing. It detailed the following experiments: 'Mars recently funded a deadly experiment on rats to determine the effects of chocolate ingredients on their blood vessels. Experimenters force-fed the rats by shoving plastic tubes down their throats and then cut open the rats' legs to expose an artery, which was clamped shut to block blood flow. After the experiment, the animals were killed. Mars has also funded cruel experiments in which mice were fed a candy ingredient and forced to swim in a pool of a water mixed with white paint. The mice had to find a hidden platform to avoid drowning, only to be killed and dissected later on. In yet another experiment supported by Mars, rats were fed cocoa and anesthetized with carbon dioxide so that their blood could be collected by injecting a needle directly into their hearts, which can lead to internal bleeding and other deadly complications.' (ref: 76)

(See also 'Boycott call by Uncaged for animal testing' in Animal Testing above.)

Political Activities

Criticism of EU health laws on restricting obesity (2007)

According to the Ecologist December/January 2008 in October 2007 Mars criticised new EU health laws introduced to tackle the growing obesity epidemic, claiming they could be used to restrict advertising. (ref: 77)

Member of National Foreign Trade Council (25 May 2007)

According to the website of the National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC), www.nftc.org, visited on 8th June 2007, Mars Inc. 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: 78)

Membership of ICC lobby group (2007)

The website of the International Chamber of Commerce (www.iccwbo.org), viewed on 16th May 2007, listed Mars 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: 79)

Anti-Social Finance

Subsidiaries in three tax havens (June 2008)

According to the corporate website of Mars Inc, viewed by ECRA in June 2008, (www.mars.com) the company had subsidiaries in three countries which ECRA considered to be tax havens: Ireland, Philippines and Singapore. (ref: 70)

Co-op Cat Food

Owned by Co-operative Group Ltd

Co-operative Group Ltd, PO Box 53, New Century House, Manchester, M60 4ES, UK

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best ECRA rating for environment report (2008)

The Co-operative Group's Sustainability Report 2008/09 contained a number of targets, including:

"Reduce energy consumption by 20% by 2010 and 25% by 2012, based on 2006 levels...

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from refrigeration in the Co-operative Food's stores by 20% by 2011, based on 2007 levels." The report contained meaningful carbon disclosure, including a breakdown of CO2 emissions from transport types, and noted that in 2008 the Group, via the Aldersgate Group, wrote to the Prime Minister calling for mandatory carbon accounting and reporting. The report also noted engagement with the Carbon Trust's product carbon footprinting programme. The report was assured to Global Reporting Initiative Standards and independent assurance was undertaken by Two Tomorrows (Europe) Limited.

The Co-operative Group was therefore awarded a best rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 80)

Climate Change

"Working towards" eliminating non certified sustainable palm oil (September 2009)

WWF produced a Palm Oil Buyers' Scorecard in 2009 which measured the progress of 59 major European retailers and manufacturers on their sourcing of sustainable palm oil. The Co-op Group was not in the top ten companies nor was it one of the companies that had made time bound commitments to source 100% certified sustainable palm oil. Its overall score was 13 out of 29 - compared to scores between 21 and 26 for those in the top ten.

ECRA therefore rated the Co-op negatively for climate change and habitats and resources due to the impacts of the global palm oil industry. (ref: 81)

Habitats & Resources

(See also "Working towards" eliminating non certified sustainable palm oil' in Climate Change above.)

Policy on sustainable sourcing of fish (2008)

In response to a request by ECRA for the Co-operative Group's policy on the sustainable sourcing of fish, the company stated that its range of own brand products from MSC certified sources had increased from 2 in 2007 to 10 by the end of 2008. Three further products were to come from fisheries currently being assessed for MSC accreditation. The company's statement also included the following sustainability initiatives it followed:

- own-brand tuna caught by methods that conform to the Earth Island Institute (EII) dolphin-safe standards
- the company was a promoter of humane stunning prior to slaughter for all farmed fish
- all warm-water prawns sourced from well-established farms in Indonesia and Thailand, and all Global Aquaculture Alliance (GAA) certified, or working towards certification

Because the company had set no future targets to significantly increase numbers of MSC certified fish products, it received a negative mark in this category, as well as a positive one. (ref: 82)

Stocked fish from unsustainable sources (March 2007)

Co-op was ranked 7th (of 8 supermarkets) in the 2007 Marine

Conservation Society's Sustainable Seafood Supermarket league table. According to the table ranking, Co-op was still selling one species from the MCS fish to avoid list, although only 0.95% of its sales came from the fish to avoid species. The company received a score of 6 (out of 10) for its wild caught fish policy and 2.5 (out of 10) for its farmed fish policy. (ref: 83)

Animals

Animal Testing

All cosmetics, toiletries and household products carry BUAV logo (October 2008)

According to the Co-operative's response to a questionnaire sent to it by ECRA in October 2008 100% of its own-brand toiletries carried the BUAV 'rabbit and stars' logo. As part of its accreditation, a fixed cut-off date of 1985 was agreed. This means that no own-brand toiletry products, or their ingredients, have been tested on animals since 1985. It went on to state that in 1990 it announced that no own-brand toiletry products would contain any ingredient tested on animals after 1985, becoming the first retailer to be accredited to the BUAV humane cosmetics standard. Continuing this work, in 2004 it was the first grocery retailer to be accredited with BUAV's Humane Household Products Standard.

According to the BUAV, to be approved for the Humane Cosmetics Standard and the Humane Household Products Standard, a company must no longer conduct or commission animal testing and must apply a verifiable fixed cut-off date - an unmoveable date after which none of the products or ingredients have been animal tested. Each company must be open to an independent audit throughout the supply chain to ensure that they adhere to the animal testing policy criteria.

However, the Co-operative also retailed non-own brand products which were tested on animals so received ECRA's middle rating for animal testing policy. (ref: 82)

Factory farming

Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic (2008)

In response to a request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company's animal welfare policy, the Co-op stated that it offered the largest selection of RSPCA Freedom Food-labelled products and, that "from 2006, preference was given, where feasible, to Freedom Food ingredients in the formulation of premium range products." The response also stated that from 2007 the company ensured that its meat products met with UK farm assurance standards as a minimum, including that from non-UK producers, excepting pork, bacon and sausage, for which only UK producers met these standards. However, the Co-op did not give figures for free range products sold, nor set any targets to increase their sale in future. Since it sold meat not labelled as free range or organic, the company received a negative mark in this category. (ref: 82)

Sold factory farmed chickens (2006)

According to Supermarkets & Farm Animal Welfare 'Raising the Standard' published by the Compassion in World Farming Trust in 2006, over 90% of the chickens sold by Co-op supermarkets were intensively farmed. The report stated that the Co-op had set a maximum stocking guideline of 38kg bird per metre squared of floor space, which exceeded the government guidelines of a maximum of 34kg bird per metre squared of floor space. (ref: 84)

Retail of factory farmed pigmeat (2006)

According to Supermarkets & Farm Animal Welfare 'Raising the Standard' published by the Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) Trust in 2006, 42% of pig meat sold by the Co-op supermarkets had come from close confinement farrowing crates. CIWF had

urged all supermarkets to produce pigmeat from well managed outdoor farms as it regarded this as the most welfare-friendly rearing system. (ref: 84)

Animal Rights

Sale of slaughterhouse by-products (2008)

The Co-operative's website (www.co-operative.coop), viewed by ECRA in November 2008, showed the company to be selling a number of processed food products which were likely to contain slaughterhouse by-products including rennet and gelatine. (ref: 85)

(See also 'Sale of meat not labelled as free range or organic' in Factory farming above.)

Sold products containing slaughterhouse by-products (2007)

A shop survey in April 2007 found Co-op supermarkets sold products containing slaughterhouse by-products. (ref: 86)

People

Human Rights

(See also "Working towards" eliminating non certified sustainable palm oil' in Climate Change above.)

Developments in Ethical Engagement (June 2005)

According to an article in the Guardian Online, dated 27th June 2005, the Co-operative Insurance Society (CIS) had announced the development of a new 'ethical engagement policy, and claimed that it was 'the first insurer in the world' to do so. The policy was said to have been devised after a year of consultation with stakeholders and would inform a programme of shareholder activism and campaigning on a range of issues, including the arms trade and animal testing. (ref: 87)

Workers' Rights

Fined for unsafe workplace (2006)

According to an article dated 31st August 2006 on the industry website workplacelaw.net, in 2006 the Co-op was fined £40,000 after a council inspection of its Heathfield store revealed "breaches of health and safety legislation." The inspection was said to have followed an incident in which an employee's arm was injured by a mechanical lift, and was said to have uncovered defective electrical systems, obstructed fire exits and unsafe items of lifting equipment. (ref: 88)

Supply Chain Policy

Best ECRA rating for code of conduct (September 2009)

In September 2009 the Co-operative Food returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding the company's policy addressing workers rights at supplier companies or any policies regarding sourcing, the company attached a document entitled "The Co-operative Sound Sourcing Code of Conduct for the Co-operative Group Limited Suppliers". The Code was said to be based on the ETI Base Code and International Labour Organisation standards, and the company was said to be a member of the ETI. The document contained adequate clauses for freely chosen employment; freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining; no use of child labour; payment of a living wage; limitation on working hours and no discrimination. Under a section entitled 'Audit Activity' the document stated that "The Co-operative Group Limited, its agents or approved audit bodies, will routinely review suppliers' practice and achievements against the principles of this Code."

Ethical Consumer also looked at the company's Sustainability Report 2007/2008. The report stated that over half of the audit carried out in 2007 were external or multistakeholder audits. For these reasons, the company was given Ethical Consumer's best rating for supply chain policy.

Of note was the statement that the company had been working with NGOs and other stakeholders in the establishment of a global

Local Resources Network, to help undertake assessments (audits) and remediation. (ref: 89)

Membership of ETI (August 2005)

According to the ETI website www.ethicaltrade.org, visited on 17th August 2005, the Co-operative Group (CWS) was listed as a member. For companies to be accepted as members, they were required to adopt the ETI Base Code of Conduct and implement it into their supply chains. Progress reports on code implementation, and on improvements to labour practices was required. (ref: 90)

Irresponsible Marketing

Sale of tobacco products (2007)

The Mintel December 2007 Convenience Retailing Report defined convenience retailers as 'open 7 days a week... and selling an extended range of goods including tobacco products...' Co-operative group was a retailer profiled in this report. (ref: 91)

Harmful chemical found in soft drinks (2006)

According to an article on the BBC News website (<http://news.co.uk>) dated 31st March 2006, the Co-op's low-calorie bitter lemon drink with a best-before date of June 2006 contained benzene levels of 28 parts per billion (ppb). A second batch of the same drink, with August 10th best-before date had 11 ppb. In the UK, drinking water should contain a benzene level of no more than one part per billion (ppb). The World Health Organisation's health limit was said to be 10 ppb. The Co-op had already removed the affected batches from the shelves by the time the article was published. Benzene can cause certain cancers, and is thought to be formed when the commonly used soft-drink ingredients- the preservative sodium benzoate and ascorbic acid- interact. (ref: 92)

Best independent rating on health responsibility index (November 2005)

BBC News reported on 25 November 2005 that the National Consumer Council had rated the supermarkets on their approach to salt reduction, nutrition labelling, in-store promotions and customer information. The study found that supermarkets were more likely to promote unhealthy foods than fresh produce and none had met the NCC's target of offering 33% of promotions on fruit and vegetables. The National Consumer Council produced a Health Responsibility Index of the supermarkets based on the survey, the Co-op was ranked best of the nine supermarkets. (ref: 93)

Arms & Military Supply

Investment relationship with arms sector (2007)

According to the Socially Responsible Investment section of the company website www.cis.co.uk, viewed by ECRA in September 2007, the Co-operative Insurance Society (CIS) had shares in arms companies Cobham and GKN. (ref: 94)

Banking or investment relationship with arms manufacturers (2006)

The Co-operative Group's 2006 Sustainability Report contained a section on 'Ethical Finance' which

listed a number of companies that the Group's Co-operative Insurance invested in where it had voted against or abstained from the acceptance of report and accounts on grounds relating to social, ethical or environmental issues. One of the companies listed was BAe Systems plc, an arms manufacturer. (ref: 95)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

Positive but inadequate policy addressing GM (September 2009)

In September 2009 the Co-operative Food returned a questionnaire to Ethical Consumer. In response to a question regarding the use of genetically engineered ingredients in products and the use of ingredients from animals fed on GM animal feed, the company

provided a detailed response which stated that, with regard to its own-brand range, the products did not contain any ingredients or additives derived from genetically modified organisms (GMOs). This position was said to have been achieved in 1999.

In terms of animal feed, where animals were fed a mixed diet that included soya, it was stated that "there is a risk that this may be from a GM source, since identity-preserved segregated non-GM sources of these staple feed crops are limited in availability, especially with the recently changed legislative environment in Brazil." A list of animals sold under the company's own brand which were not fed a GM diet was provided, and included chicken, turkey and salmon. Regarding beef and lamb, the company stated that animals were "reared outdoors on grass pasture, but during the winter months the feed can be supplemented with concentrates, which may include soya, which we cannot guarantee is not from a GM crop."

A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Due to the prevalence of genetically modified animal feed on the market, it was assumed by Ethical Consumer that the company was involved in the sale of products which were made from ingredients derived from animals that had been fed genetically modified feed. Furthermore, it was noted that the company had made no commitment to supply non own-brand products that were GM free. (ref: 96)

Political Activities

Donations to the Co-operative Party (2009)

According to the Co-operative Group's 2007-2008 Sustainability Report it donated to a number of organisations that represented and promoted the co-operative movement, including the Co-operative Party. The Co-operative Party works in affiliation with the Labour Party at Parliamentary level, fielding MPs under a Labour and Co-operative Party ticket. The report stated:

"The Co-operative Group is a significant supporter of The Co-operative Party, which was created in 1917 by the UK Co-operative Movement in order to promote its values and principles. The Party works to raise awareness of the benefits of the co-operative and mutual models, and to influence Government towards support for more co-operative action. The Co-operative Party has representation in both Houses of Parliament, the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly of Wales and the Greater London Assembly, and, additionally, has over 350 local councillors.

In 2007, an overall financial contribution of £646,103 (2006: £464,900) was made to The Co-operative Party in respect of the annual subscription and support for Party Councils. This includes payment of £546,377 by The Co-operative Group and a further £99,726 made directly by United Co-operatives prior to the merger. An in-kind donation of £1,250 was also made by the Group to the Party, in the form of the provision of office space and use of a telephone. In addition, miscellaneous expenditure was incurred in support of the Labour Party at a constituency and regional level, amounting to £4,830." (ref: 97)

Anti-Social Finance

Allegations of unlawful practices linked to tobacco prices (April 2008)

According to an article which appeared on the BBC news website on the 25th of April 2008, the Office of Fair Trading (OFT) had alleged that tobacco firms and supermarkets had been engaged in unlawful practices linked to retail prices for tobacco. Allegations were that retailers and tobacco groups had arranged to swap information on future pricing, and that there was an understanding that the price of some brands would be linked to rival brands. The Co-operative Group was one of the companies named by

the OFT. (ref: 98)

Company Ethos

(See also 'All cosmetics, toiletries and household products carry BUAV logo' in Animal Testing above.)

Not for profit group structure (April 2005)

According to the Co-operative group website, www.co-op.co.uk, viewed In April 2005, "We don't exist to make a profit for shareholders. Like all co-operatives, our number one priority is to provide the best possible service to our members. This means: - making our businesses the best they can be - reinvesting in the communities where our members live." At the time of writing, ECRA rated companies with a not-for-profit trading structure as potentially more sustainable in the long term. (ref: 99)

Eukanuba Cat Food

Owned by Procter & Gamble Company

Procter & Gamble Company, One Procter & Gamble Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, USA

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for environmental reporting (2009)

The Procter and Gamble 2009 sustainability report was viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The report contained a number of future quantified targets which were: to deliver an additional 20% reduction (per unit production) in CO2 emissions, energy consumption, water consumption and disposed waste from P&G plants, leading to a total reduction over the decade of at least 50%; to develop and market at least \$50 billion in cumulative sales of "sustainable innovation products," which are products that have an improved environmental profile. The report included past performance against a number of environmental key performance indicators including greenhouse gas emissions, energy use, waste production and water use. However the report did not show a reasonable understanding of the company's environmental impacts as Procter and Gamble's was a chemical company but other than reporting on the amount of hazardous waste produced there was no information on the types of dangerous / toxic chemicals used, how these were disposed of and no targets for reduction or replacement of harmful chemicals. Neither was there any information on extraction or manipulation of raw materials. There was also no evidence of the report being independently verified. Procter and Gamble received Ethical Consumer's middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 100)

Climate Change

One of the worst US polluters (2008)

According to a report published by the Political Economy Research Institute on 30th April 2008 on the website www.peri.umass.edu, Procter & Gamble was on the list of the 100 worst polluters of US air in 2005. The report had taken into account the toxicity of chemicals and number of people impacted by the companies' air releases in the US. (ref: 101)

Climate change impacts of palm oil (2007)

According to an article in the Guardian newspaper, www.guardian.co.uk, dated 8th November 2007, in 2007 environmental group Greenpeace had accused major food companies such as Procter & Gamble of potentially creating a climate change catastrophe due to their high use of palm oil. Oil palm plantations used by major food companies were said to be resulting in the release of CO2 stored in massive peat deposits in Indonesia. As well as destroying huge areas of habitats of endangered species, the destruction of the peat bogs was said to be likely to contribute massively to climate change emissions. (ref: 5)

Inadequate palm oil policy (2009)

The Procter and Gamble 2009 sustainability report was viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The report contained the company's palm oil policy which was as follows: 'P&G is committed to the sustainable sourcing of palm oil. By 2015, we intend to purchase and use palm oil that we can confirm to have originated from responsible and sustainable sources.' A search was made of the Round Table for Sustainable Palm Oil website and Procter and Gamble was not listed as a member. At the time of writing Procter and Gamble was purchasing non-sustainable palm oil, regardless of its intention not to do so in the future. (ref: 100)

Pollution & Toxics

The Campaign for Safe Cosmetics (www.safecosmetics.org) published a report, "A Poison Kiss: the Problem of Lead in Lipstick," in October 2007. According to the report one third of the lipsticks tested exceeded Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) 0.1 ppm limit of set for lead in children's confectionery - a standard established to protect children from directly ingesting lead. The report noted that lipstick is also ingested directly but that the FDA did not set limits for lead in cosmetics.

Those listed included three types of Procter and Gamble brand Cover Girl. Lead was not listed as an ingredient on the product.

The report noted that "Lead is a proven neurotoxin that can cause learning, language and behavioural problems... Pregnant women and young children are particularly vulnerable to lead exposure.... Lead has also been linked to miscarriage, reduced fertility in both men and women, hormonal changes, menstrual irregularities and delays in the onset of puberty." Furthermore lead is bio-accumulative, building up in the body with repeated exposure. (ref: 102)

Use of nanoparticle ingredients (2007)

According to the 2007 Corporate Watch report 'Nanotechnology: undersized, unregulated and already here', various P&G/Olay cosmetics including Complete All Day UV Moisture Lotion contained nanoparticle zinc oxide. The report documented the growing evidence that nanomaterials pose a unique but so far poorly understood range of toxicity problems, along with concerns about the wider social and economic impacts of nanotechnology. (ref: 103)

Habitats & Resources

(See also 'Inadequate palm oil policy' in Climate Change above.)

Not a member of the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (July 2007) BRY THIS IS OLD BUT I THOUGHT I'D UPDATED IT - MAYBE I HAVE BUT HAVEN'T MOVED THE REF TO PRIMARY - COULD YOU CHECK - if not I will do it on Tuesday and we can add it in if that's ok. Procter and Gamble was not listed as a member of the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) when the organisation's website (www.rspo.org) was visited in July 2007. ECRA queried this position with Procter and Gamble and received a reply by email on 6 July 2007. The reply stated:

"We have followed the work of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, since its inception, through our joint venture partner in Malaysia and the Malaysia Oleochemical Manufacturing Group (MOMG). We share our sustainability guidelines with our suppliers, and we support the principles of the RSPO initiative through our joint venture partner and through our membership in the Malaysian Oleochemical Manufacturer Group. P&G agrees with the criteria established by the Roundtable and has followed Roundtable meetings through our association with these leading organizations in the palm oil industry. We believe it is appropriate for our support to continue through our partner and associations who have significantly more on the ground expertise in such areas

as palm plantation management practices and who are located in the major producing regions of the world.”

However other manufacturers and major retailers were directly members of the RSPO, the rationale being that these companies push their support for RSPO through their supply chains.

No public statement of support for the RSPO could be found, nor did the company’s 2006 Sustainability Report contain any reference to palm oil and its environmental impacts.

ECRA therefore considered that as a major manufacturer utilising palm oil, without any evident policy to otherwise deal with sustainability issues around palm oil production, the company should have participated in the RSPO process.

The company therefore received negative marks for aggravated habitat destruction, climate change and impact upon endangered species (orang-utans) for its participation in the palm oil trade. (ref: 104)

(See also ‘Climate change impacts of palm oil’ in **Climate Change** above.)

Animals

Animal Testing

Worst ECRA rating for petfood animal testing policy (February 2006)

The Iams Company website (www.iamstruth.com) contained a policy document called ‘The Iams Company Animal Study Policy’ when it was viewed in February 2006. It stated that: “We have an ethical responsibility to assure our products are safe and wholesome by feeding them to dogs and cats.

We fully support the internationally accepted principles of the 3 Rs: replacement of animal studies with non-animal alternatives, reduction in the numbers of animals involved in studies and the refinement of methods to enhance animal welfare. We involve animals only if there is no valid non-animal option and are actively researching alternative methods. “The document did not mention a fixed cut off date for animal testing. (ref: 105)

Experiments involving transgenic mice (January 2010)

The following was found on the Uncaged website, www.uncaged.co.uk, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. ‘P&G are involved in genetically-engineering mice to create new ways of testing ingredients for use in products such as laundry liquids, Fairy liquid, Flash cleaner, skin care, hair products, and other cosmetics.

Genetic engineering is known to cause serious animal welfare problems due to the fact that large numbers of animals are involved, surgery and other invasive procedures are used in their creation, and that genetic modification is likely to cause harmful deformities.

In these experiments, mice were genetically engineered to be more vulnerable to asthma and lung damage. The substance (a P&G-patent detergent enzyme called ‘subtilisin’) was repeatedly injected into the bodies and up the noses of the mice, causing their lungs to become damaged and filled with blood, followed by pneumonia. (ref: 106)

Boycott call by Uncaged (2009)

The Uncaged website, www.uncaged.co.uk, viewed by Ethical Consumer on January 8th 2010 highlighted the campaign group’s ongoing boycott of Procter & Gamble. The boycott called for consumers to boycott the company and its products because of the company’s ongoing “cruel and unnecessary” testing on animals. IAMS and Eukanuba both made by Procter and Gamble were listed on the Uncaged website’s petfood and animal testing page under the ‘brands to boycott’ section as these products were tested on animals. (ref: 106)

Factory farming

Sale of factory farmed meat (January 2010)

Procter and Gamble brand Iams’ range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.iams.com, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, had meat as a major ingredient. The meat used by the company, which included chicken lamb and beef, did not appear to be organic or free range and were therefore assumed to be from factory farm sources. (ref: 107)

Animal Rights

(See also ‘Sale of factory farmed meat’ in **Factory farming** above.)

Recall of poisonous pet food (2007)

According to the Summer 2007 issue of Earth Island Journal, March 2007 saw the biggest recall of product in the history of the pet food industry. Iams and Eukanuba were two of the companies implicated in the scandal, which had seen over 153 brands of pet foods and treats taken off the shelves all over the USA due to it containing wheat gluten and rice protein concentrate which had been contaminated with melamine, a material used to manufacture kitchen utensils and, in China, fertiliser. It said the melamine had been added to the wheat and rice in a bid to increase their protein levels, and had been imported by two US companies from China. The number of reported deaths and illnesses in pets ranged from 16 to more than 3,000, depending on the source. The sale of meat was considered an animal rights issue, as well as the incident being considered irresponsible marketing. (ref: 13)

Allegations of cruelty in animal tests (2005)

According to the summer 2005 issue of Animal Times, Iams had been criticised by animal rights campaigners for conducting unnecessarily traumatic tests on animals in its US laboratories. This included protein digestability experiments on young chicks which, according to Animal Times, severely retarded the birds’ growth and were “so cruel and so ineffective that two of Iams’ biggest competitors refuse to conduct them.”

In other tests, beagles had sutures tied around their gums to cut into them, causing gingivitis, the subject of the study. After pieces of gum were then cut from the dogs’ mouths for analysis, they were used for more studies, instead of being re-housed into humane homes.

Iams was also criticised for its sponsorship of the Iditarod dog race in Alaska in which, according to Animal Times, an Iams-sponsored dog team was pushed so hard that the lead dog collapsed and died. (ref: 108)

People

Human Rights

(See also ‘Inadequate palm oil policy’ in **Climate Change** above.)

Operations in 17 oppressive regimes (January 2010)

The Procter & Gamble website www.pg.com viewed by ECRA in January 2010, listed company offices in the following countries considered by ECRA to be oppressive regimes at the time of reporting: Belarus, China, Egypt, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Pakistan, Philippines, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, USA, Uzbekistan and Vietnam. (ref: 109)

Workers’ Rights

Self disclosure of pollution and health and safety violations (2009)

The Procter and Gamble 2009 sustainability report was viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The report contained a section entitled ‘Notice of Violations (NOVs)’ which listed global data on environmental, transportation, and worker health and safety violations over the past three years. It stated that in 2009, the number of fines decreased in every category, particularly in its focus area of transportation. It gave figures for number of

violations and total cost of fines as follows: 2009: 34 \$15,285, 2008: 82 \$305,328, 2007:37 \$106,257. It then gave a more detailed breakdown of global Notices of Violation (NOVs) and including U.S. Occupational Safety and Health

Administration (OSHA) interventions for 2009, giving both the number of violations and cost of fines: Water-Based 16 \$ 6,000 , Air-Based 4 \$ 0, Solid Waste-Based 0 \$ 0, Paperwork 0

\$ 0, Transportation-Based 5 \$ 3,000 Other 1 \$ 0, Worker Safety 8 \$ 6,285, Total 34 \$ 15,285. (ref: 100)

Chinese factories investigation (January 2005)

Chinese Labour Watch conducted investigations into two Procter and Gamble Factories by interviewing employees outside the factory gates. The first, was at Procter & Gamble's Huangpu factory in Guangzhou City, Guangdong Province. Temporary workers, contracted by Bestfriend Human Resource Co Ltd, worked 12 hour days as standard with four days off per month. (i.e. 72 hour weeks) and were forced to do additional overtime on top of this at a separate site, a Procter & Gamble distribution centre. If workers didn't put in overtime they were sanctioned by Bestfriend Co by either having money deducted from their wages or being suspended for seven days without pay. The second investigation was at Chengdu Procter & Gamble Ltd, Chengdu City, Sichuan Province. Here working hours were not excessive being 8 hours a day with a day off every four days. However excessive penalties were used in the case of products being lost due to worker error. Workers had 10 yuan deducted from their wages and also had to compensate for the lost product. As temporary workers usually earned 23 yuan a day, 10 yuan amounted to nearly half a days wages. (ref: 111)

(See also 'Revelations of Chinese working conditions' in Human Rights above.)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain code (2009)

Ethical Consumer downloaded Procter and Gambles Sustainability Guidelines for Suppliers, dated 2009, from the website, www.pgsupplier.com, in January 2010. The guidelines included prohibition of child labour, where the age of a child was defined as 15 in the absence of any national or local law unless ILO exceptions apply; prison, indentured or bonded labor, or using corporal punishment or other forms of mental and physical coercion as a form of discipline; unacceptable worker treatment such as harassment, discrimination, physical or mental punishment, or other forms of abuse. Suppliers must provide a safe and healthy working environment and at a minimum comply with all applicable wage and hour laws, and rules and regulations, including minimum wage, overtime and maximum hours, however it did not specify payment of a living wage. The document said that the company respects employees' right to freedom of association, third party consultation and collective bargaining where allowed by law but did not make this a specific standard for suppliers. In addition there was no anti-discrimination commitment, no limitations on working hours. There was also no mention of monitoring suppliers for compliance with the guidelines. Procter and Gamble therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 112)

Irresponsible Marketing

Recall of nasal sprays due to bacterial contamination (November 2009)

According to an article posted on the bbc news website Procter & Gamble had announced it was recalling 120,000 bottles of Vicks Sinex nasal spray after small traces of bacteria were found in the product. Bottles shipped to the US, the UK and Germany were being recalled after traces of the B. cepacia bacteria were found at a German plant in Gross Gerau. Procter and Gamble said no illnesses had been reported, but the bacteria can affect people with lung problems. The consumer products giant stressed the recall

was just a precautionary measure, but added that "the bacteria could cause serious infections for individuals with a compromised immune system, or those with chronic lung conditions, such as cystic fibrosis." (ref: 113)

Advertising to high school students (2007)

According to Multinational Monitor March/April 2007 advertisers were homing in on high school cheerleaders in the hope of benefiting from word of mouth marketing, by exploiting the idea that cheerleaders are popular and influential. To this end, companies were said to have signed sponsorship deals with firms such as Varsity Spirit, which organised cheerleading camps and competitions.

Procter and Gamble was said to offer samples and services at cheerleading events, including hair styling by Herbal Essences representatives or make up tips by Cover Girl spokespeople. (ref: 114)

Banned substances found in P&G products in China (September 2006)

According to an article on the website www.forbes.com dated 18th September 2006, the Chinese General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine of said it has detected the banned substances chromium and neodymium in nine types of Japanese-made Procter & Gamble cosmetics sold under the SK-II brand.

The substances, which were not permitted for use in cosmetics because of potential reactions like eczema and eye irritation, were discovered by the Guangdong Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau, the Shanghai Daily reported.

While purchasers of the unsafe products were eligible for a refund, P&G said SK-II products would not be removed from the market for the time being.

P&G said it has not added these substances to its SK-II products, adding that all its products undergo rigorous safety and quality checks. (ref: 115)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

(See also 'Experiments involving transgenic mice' in Animal Testing above.)

No GM policy found on company website (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer searched the Procter and Gamble website, www.pg.com, in January 2010. No such policy could be found. The company sold some human food products, without a policy dictating otherwise it was highly likely that these food products contained genetically modified ingredients. In addition the company sold pet food containing meat therefore it was likely that company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there was a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 109)

Boycott Call

(See also 'Boycott call by Uncaged' in Animal Testing above.)

Boycott call by Peta (2007) THIS NEEDS UPDATING – I THOUGHT I ALREADY HAD, AGAIN I MAY HAVE JUST NOT PROMOTED IT TO PRIMARY.

Peta's Iams website (www.iamscruelty.com) confirmed that the boycott of Iams products was ongoing when it was viewed by ECRA in February 2007. According to Peta, the boycott would continue until Iams stopped conducting experiments on animals, and instead used laboratory analysis of formulas for nutritional composition and in-home studies using dogs and cats who had been volunteered by their human companions. (ref: 116)

Political Activities

Member of industry association barred from WHO (February 2006)

According to an article from the Environment News Service, dated 2nd February 2006, posted on www.corpwatch.org, the World Health Organization (WHO) had barred life sciences industry association International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI), of which Procter & Gamble was a member, over concerns that its members had a financial stake in the outcome of setting global standards protecting food and water supplies. According to the article, ILSI had funded WHO research that found no direct link between sugar consumption and obesity, had tried to avoid stronger curbs on toxic pollutants, and tried to discredit a possible link between perfluorochemicals and cancer. (ref: 28)

Member of one international lobby group (2010)

According to the organisation's website www.wbcsd.org, viewed by ECRA in January 2010, in 2010 Procter & Gamble 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: 117)

Membership of NFTC lobby group (August 2009)

According to the website of the National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC), www.nftc.org, visited in August 2009, Procter & Gamble 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: 118)

Anti-Social Finance

Subsidiaries in eight tax havens (January 2010)

The Procter & Gamble website www.pg.com viewed by ECRA in January 2010, listed company offices in the following countries considered by ECRA to be tax havens at the time of reporting: Bahrain, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Ireland, Panama, Philippines and Singapore. (ref: 109)

Operations in tax havens (2005)

The July 2005 issue of Multinational Monitor reported that Procter & Gamble was one of a number of large US corporations which had grown so large due to their use of tax havens. Multinational Monitor stated that the companies "would not have become the massive, integrated organisations they are today without the direct involvement of tax havens." Tax havens were said to be used to store profits without paying tax on them, thereby freeing money to fund international expansion; the article speculated that without US government tax breaks and the use of tax havens large multinationals would not have been able to afford to become international firms. (ref: 120)

Wafcol Vegetarian Dog Food [A]

Owned by Armitage Pet Care

Armitage Pet Care is owned by Focus 100 Ltd

Focus 100 Ltd, Armitage House, Colwick, Nottingham, NG4 2BA

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environment report (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the Armitage website, www.armitages.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, other than the following statement 'We take our environmental responsibilities very seriously, and actively encourage initiatives that help reduce our environmental impact both as a manufacturer and importer.' This was not considered adequate, the company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 121)

Animals

Animal Testing

Worst ECRA rating for animal testing policy (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Armitage Pet Care website, www.armitages.co.uk, for the company's animal testing policy. No such policy could be found. Armitage Pet Care was not endorsed on either the Uncaged or PETA website as a company that did not test its pet foods on animals. (ref: 121)

Factory farming

Sale of non-free range meat (January 2010)

Armitage Pet Care's range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.armitages.com, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, included meat based offerings which did not appear to use organic or free range meat. (ref: 121)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of non-free range meat' in Factory farming above.)

Supply to greyhound racing industry (January 2010)

According to the Armitage Pet Care website, www.armitages.co.uk, viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, the company made a range of dog food specifically for performance greyhounds. Greyhound racing has been heavily criticised by animal welfare and animal rights group who claim that dogs used in greyhound racing were often poorly treated and killed after they ceased to be useful for racing and betting purposes. Making dog food specifically for this activity constituted support for the greyhound racing industry. (ref: 121)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Supply chain policy (January 2010)

The following was found on the Armitage Pet Care website, www.armitages.co.uk with regard to its supply chain. Armitage Pet Care has ethics at its heart. We work hard to ensure our people, consumers (furry or otherwise), customers, and suppliers are treated fairly and that our products are produced to the highest standards. Our suppliers are selected based on our strict ethical policies which include: Freedom of employment, Safe & Hygienic working conditions, No child labour, Anti discrimination policies. We encourage all our suppliers to operate to the same ethical standards as we operate ourselves. Although it was encouraging to see a smaller company in this sector considering ethics in its supply chain, the statement was considered inadequate for the protection of workers' rights in the company's supply chain as it did not contain clauses referring to freedom of association or collective bargaining, limitations on the hours in the working

week, payment of a living wage, limit the age of a child to under 15. Furthermore the company said it only encouraged suppliers to act accordingly, rather than make it a contractual obligation to meet its ethical standards. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for its supply chain policy. (ref: 121)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No policy on GM on company website (January 2010)

There was no GM policy apparent on the Armitage Pet Care website, www.armitages.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. As the company sold pet food containing both grain and meat it was likely that, in the absence of such a policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil

Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 121)

NEEDS PRODUCT SUSTAINABILITY REF (VEGE) NEEDS SNAPSHOTTING FROM REFSBASE

Hill's Science Plan Cat Food

Owned by Hill's Pet Nutrition

Hill's Pet Nutrition is owned by Colgate-Palmolive Co

Colgate-Palmolive Co, 300 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10022, USA

Colgate-Palmolive Co also owns Hill's Science Plan Dog Food

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle Ethical Consumer rating for environmental reporting (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer viewed the Colgate-Palmolive website, www.colgate.com, in January 2010 and found a section on sustainability which it said related to 2008 data and information. There was reporting on past performance against a number of key performance indicators. There were also a number of future quantified targets for reducing the company's environmental impact. However the report did not show a reasonable understanding of all of the company's environmental impacts as Colgate-Palmolive was involved in the sale of chemical based products but there was no reporting on hazardous waste produced and there was no information on the types of dangerous / toxic chemicals used, how these were disposed of and no targets for reduction or replacement of harmful chemicals. Neither was there any information on extraction or manipulation of raw materials. There was also no evidence of the information being independently verified. Colgate-Palmolive received Ethical Consumer's middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 122)

Pollution & Toxics

Use of phthalates in consumer products (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer searched the Colgate-Palmolive website, www.colgate.com, in January 2010 and found the following information regarding phthalates — The term "phthalates" is used to describe a large and diverse group of substances that are widely used in many everyday products. The specific members of the phthalate family of ingredients used in Colgate's products have an excellent safety profile and are present at very low levels.

Independent scientists and governmental bodies have extensively studied the compounds' health and environmental effects, making phthalates some of the most investigated and best understood compounds in the world. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Health Canada and other scientific bodies in Europe, North America and Japan have examined phthalates and allow their continued use. Phthalates were also reviewed by the Cosmetic Ingredient Review (CIR), an independent body that reviews the safety of ingredients used in cosmetics. CIR found them to be safe for use in cosmetics. As with all Colgate products, any specific member of this group of substances used in our products is supported by an extensive body of scientific research and data that confirms safety.

Despite these reassurances however, phthalates, are considered to be widespread contaminants linked to hormone disruption, birth defects, kidney, liver and testicular damage. (ref: 122)

Products containing triclosan, a bioaccumulative chemical (2007)

A shop survey was conducted by ECRA in November 2007. Colgate toothpaste was found to contain triclosan, an anti-bacterial organochlorine.

According to an article in ENDS Report 386 (March 2007, pp30-33) triclosan was found to accumulate in caged fish kept near sewage outlets in Sweden, as well as human breast milk. The substance is toxic to a range of aquatic species, especially algae. A laboratory study induced hormone disruption in tadpoles. An industry working group of which Colgate-Palmolive was part proposed increasing allowed toxicity levels ten fold after initial research showed 15% of samples close to or above the allowed limit. (ref: 123)

Habitats & Resources

Inadequate policy on palm oil (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer found Colgate-Palmolive's palm oil policy on its website, www.colgate.com, in January 2010 which stated the following:

Colgate-Palmolive is committed to protecting and conserving the environment while meeting the needs of our consumers, customers, employees, shareholders and other stakeholders.

Colgate-Palmolive has long focused its efforts on ensuring that the palm oil used in our soap products is legally sourced. In the past five years, we have increased our efforts to promote development of sustainable palm oil in a manner that will benefit the environment without adversely affecting developing local economies or the availability of palm oil. We are strongly committed to continuing these efforts.

To that end, a Corporate officer recently met with the Chief Executive of the Malaysian Palm Oil Association (MPOA), the Director-General of the Malaysian Palm Oil Board (MPOB), and the Head, Research & Development, MPOB to discuss their efforts and progress toward establishing ISPO certification standards, training auditors and legislating enforcement.

It is clear the Malaysian government believes that by working with the major producers of palm oil, they are making significant strides to develop increased sustainability, profitability and protection of the environment. They report that there are 15-18 large producers awaiting ISPO certification and that others will follow.

While palm oil is an important ingredient to our Company, we purchase less than 0.09 million tons per year out of an

estimated 34.7 million tons per year from the combined output of Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand--(two-tenths of a percent of these countries' total output). Our palm oil is purchased as a commodity and the brokers periodically assert that as best can be determined, it is sourced legally and in accordance with that country's environmental standards.

Colgate-Palmolive will continue to seek sources of sustainable palm oil. While we have previously sought to identify an alternative to palm oil, either organic or synthetic, we have been unable to identify a viable substitute. Therefore, our continuing commitment is to work with those who seek to develop sustainable palm oil supplies.

Colgate is a member of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, an organization that seeks to develop standards in conjunction with the government and owners to insure palm oil is grown and harvested in a sustainable manner thereby insuring no harm to the environment, fairness to plantation employees and an ongoing supply of certifiable, sustainable palm oil.

However at the time of writing Colgate-Palmolive were still evidently sourcing non-certified, unsustainable palm oil and therefore received negative marks in the climate change, habitats and resources and human rights categories. (ref: 122)

Animals

Animal Testing

Animal testing not required by law (November 2007)

Colgate-Palmolive was on a list of 'Companies that test on animals' produced by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and found at www.caringconsumer.com/page/CompaniesDo.pdf, viewed November 2007.

The company was on the list because it manufactured personal care and household products that were tested on animals even though it was not required by law.

Colgate produced a document dated 2004, 'Colgate: Respecting the World Around Us', which stated that it had had a moratorium on animal testing for personal care products designed for adults since 1999. (ref: 124)

Worst Ethical Consumer rating for animal testing policy (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer found a page entitled 'Concern for Animal Welfare' on the Colgate-Palmolive website, www.colgate.com, viewed in January 2010 which stated the following:

Colgate remains steadfast in its goal to meet safety requirements, whenever possible, through the use of existing data so that humans and animals are not put at risk. Since 2004, more than 99 percent of all internal requests for product safety assessment have been addressed using non-animal alternatives or existing databases. Animal testing is conducted only when all other options have been exhausted. For Colgate's consumer products all required animal testing is conducted at outside laboratories under Colgate supervision using a minimum number of animals. We have stringent guidelines for evaluating testing facilities and reviewing animal research proposals.

In 1997, Colgate instituted a policy requiring senior management to approve all animal testing for any country requiring the testing. Additionally, since 1999, Colgate has voluntarily suspended all animal testing in the adult Personal Care Product category. In other product categories, there may be situations when safety demonstrations are needed and no scientifically approved

alternative to animal testing exists. We are working with other companies and organisations that share our goals to bring our scientifically researched alternatives to animal testing to the attention of government regulators to urge their approval. For example, we are working with European cosmetic manufacturers to develop procedures for evaluating alternative eye irritation tests acceptable to European Community regulators. As long as nine years ago, we partnered with the International Life Sciences Institute to support progression of alternatives. We have also created our own research initiatives with the Institute for In-Vitro Sciences and we have served as a member of their Advisory Committee. In addition, Colgate has been a major financial sponsor of the World Congress on Alternatives since its inception.

Our broad program includes sponsoring two-year post-doctoral fellowships to support research into testing alternatives, which started in 1982. We also sponsor visiting professorships and student internships in In-Vitro Toxicology, which study alternatives to the use of animals in toxicology testing. Recently Colgate has expanded this funding program to now offer grants to support research which could lead to alternatives to the use of animals in research and testing.

As the company was still actively involved in animal testing of its products the company received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for animal testing. (ref: 122)

Boycott called by Uncaged for animal testing policy (January 2010)

The Uncaged website, www.uncaged.co.uk, was visited by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. Colgate Palmolive was listed as a company to boycott because it either did not have a fixed cut off date for ingredients with regard to animal testing OR openly used animal tested ingredients. (ref: 106)

Factory farming

Company sells meat products not labelled as organic (November 2007)

Hill's website (www.hillspet.com) was viewed 5th. November 2007. The company sold pet food containing meat assumed to be produced through factory farming because it was not labelled organic or free range. (ref: 125)

Animal Rights

(See factory farming above.)

People

Human Rights

(See also 'Inadequate policy on palm oil' in Habitats & Resources above.)

Operations in six oppressive regimes (2008)

According to Colgate-Palmolive's 2008 Annual Report, the company had subsidiaries in the following countries, which were regarded by Ethical Consumer as being governed by oppressive regimes at the time of writing: China, Guatemala, Philippines, Russia, Thailand and Vietnam. (ref: 126)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (January 2010)

Colgate-Palmolive's Code of Conduct was found on the company website, www.colgate.com, when searched by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The document mainly covered employee integrity, rather than workers rights. However it did contain the following statement in a small section entitled 'We oppose exploitive, inhumane labor practices.' 'Colgate opposes the illegal use of child labor, the exploitation of children, and all other forms of unacceptable treatment of workers. Moreover, it is Colgate's policy not to work with any supplier or contractor known to operate with unacceptable worker treatment such as the exploitation of children,

physical punishment, female abuse, involuntary servitude or other forms of abuse. No abuse of child or other labor laws is acceptable to the Company, and if any violation of our principles becomes known to the Company, it is grounds for immediately terminating the business relationship.' There was no reference to freedom of association, limitations on the hours in a working week, living wage or independent monitoring. The document stated it was applicable to suppliers as well as direct employees but there was no real discussion of how workers rights were upheld in its supply chain. Colgate-Palmolive therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 122)

Irresponsible Marketing

Recall of poisonous pet food (2007)

According to the Summer 2007 issue of Earth Island Journal, March 2007 saw the biggest recall of product in the history of the pet food industry. Hill's Pet Nutrition was one of the companies implicated in the scandal, which had seen over 153 brands of pet foods and treats taken off the shelves all over the USA due to it containing wheat gluten and rice protein concentrate which had been contaminated with melamine, a material used to manufacture kitchen utensils and, in China, fertiliser. It said the melamine had been added to the wheat and rice in a bid to increase their protein levels, and had been imported by two US companies from China. The number of reported deaths and illnesses in pets ranged from 16 to more than 3,000, depending on the source. (ref: 13)

Politics

Boycott Call

(See also 'Boycott called by Uncaged for animal testing policy' in Animal Testing above.)

Animal testing policy: Worst ECRA rating and boycott call (January 2010)

Hill's Pet Nutrition's website (www.hillspet.com), viewed January 2010 contained a policy statement called 'Hill's Commitment to Animal Welfare'. The statement made a number of positive provisions, such as, "We only use non-invasive, human research methods" and "We do not participate in studies that jeopardise the health of dogs and cats". The policy also noted that the company strove to find ways to reduce dependence on animal research and cited an 'artificial mouth' used in experiments. ECRA had previously discussed the policy with the Uncaged Campaign (www.uncaged.co.uk), who call for a boycott of Hill's Pet Foods. The director of the Uncaged Campaign noted that the statement did not change its policy regarding Hill's. He went on to state:

"website policy statements are not reliable...unless there is transparency and independent

scrutiny of their facilities and experimental protocols." He went on to note that the Hill's statement only mentioned dogs and cats allowing for potentially a much weaker policy governing experiments on other species. Hill's was still on Uncaged's list of petfood companies to boycott at the time of writing. (ref: 127)

Boycott call from Naturewatch for no fixed cut off for animal testing (2008)

The Naturewatch Compassionate Shopping Guide 11th edition 2008, the most recent edition at the time of writing, listed Colgate-Palmolive as a company that was not endorsed by Naturewatch. This was because Naturewatch would not endorse any company unable to demonstrate a fixed cut off date for its animal testing policy. According to Naturewatch, companies without a fixed cut off date contribute to the continued supply and demand for ingredient development. Naturewatch reasons that it is not enough for a company to state that it does not conduct or commission animal testing. If a company was genuine in its desire to stop animal testing then it can neither benefit from the use of newly tested ingredients nor contribute to the demand for development. Naturewatch went on to call a boycott of Colgate-Palmolive

until the company adopted a fixed cut-off date animal testing policy. (ref: 128)

Political Activities

Member of USCIB lobby group (2007)

The website of the US Council for International Business (www.uscib.org) in November 2007 listed Colgate-Palmolive Company as a member. The USCIB described itself as "founded in 1945 to promote an open world trading system, now among the premier pro-trade, pro-market liberalization organizations ...provides unparalleled access to international policy makers and regulatory authorities." ECRA noted that free trade lobby groups had been criticised by campaigners for lobbying for business interests at the expense of the environment, human rights and animal welfare. (ref: 30)

Low rated information 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 (51 companies) through to 'basic' (31 companies), 'developing' (10 companies), 'systematic' (8 companies) or 'integrated' reporting (0 companies). It said that Colgate-Palmolive's reporting had only merited the 'basic' category. (ref: 129)

Anti-Social Finance

Operations in seven tax havens (2008)

According to Colgate-Palmolive's 2008 Annual Report, the company had subsidiaries in the following countries, which were regarded as tax havens by Ethical Consumer at the time of writing: British Virgin Islands, Singapore, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Uruguay, Ireland and Philippines. (ref: 126)

Morrisons Cat Food

Owned by Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc

Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc, Hilmore House, Gain Lane, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD3 7DL

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle rating for environment report (June 2009)

In June 2009 ECRA performed a search on the Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc website, www.morrisons.co.uk, for a copy of the company's environmental report. The company's 2009 Corporate Social Responsibility Report was obtained. It contained a number of quantified, dated future targets, such as reducing the Carbon Footprint cumulatively by 36% by 2010 (based on 2005 emissions); replacing HCFCs with HFCs by 2010, and achieving a 15% reduction in water use by 2010 (based on 2005 baseline). Some mention of pesticides was made, but there was no mention of measure to address the company's reliance on customer car use. Therefore, the report did not show a reasonable understanding of the company's main environmental impacts. The report included a breakdown of the company's carbon emissions by type. Enviro Consulting Limited were named as independent auditors, but it was not clear whether or not they only audited carbon reduction figures. Due to the fact that the report as a whole did not appear to have been independently verified, Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc received a middle ECRA rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 130)

Poor independent rating of environmental performance (November 2006)

The National Consumer Council's 2006 report on supermarkets awarded Morrisons a poor overall rating (E) for its environmental performance. The report looked at a number of different areas including food transport, waste, nature, and sustainable farming.

These were assessed as follows:

D (room for improvement) on food transport issues. The company was also reported to air freight fruit (from India and US). It was awarded E for waste and fish, and a D for trees as only a proportion of kitchenware was FSC certified. Additionally, it only scored D for sustainable farming as there was only a restricted range of organic options in the food stores surveyed. (ref: 131)

Criticism of environmental reporting (2006)

According to a report in the Independent newspaper of 20th February 2006, Wm Morrison was one of 14 FTSE 100 companies whose CSR reports had been criticised by corporate communications consultancy Salterbaxter as containing “too little substantive information and performance data to be considered legitimate CSR reports.” (ref: 132)

Climate Change

Palm oil policy (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer viewed the Morrisons policy on palm oil sourcing on its website, www.morrisons.co.uk, in January 2010 which read as follows: We are committed to encouraging the responsible sourcing of palm oil and ensure its cultivation is not threatening forests or natural habitats. We joined the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), to help promote best practice for the cultivation and use of sustainable palm oil throughout the supply chain. We are working with our suppliers to ensure palm oil used as an ingredient in our own label products comes from sustainable sources. This was not a guarantee that the company was not using unsustainably sourced palm oil and as uptake of Certified Sustainable Palm Oil (CSPO) had been low it was highly likely that the company was using unsustainable palm oil. The company therefore received related criticisms in the climate change, habitats and resources and human rights categories. (ref: 133)

Policy on stocking local produce (2008)

The Morrisons Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2008 gave details on local products stocked in Morrisons stores. These included 500 dedicated Scottish products in Scottish stores, 230 locally sourced products in Welsh stores, a North Yorkshire fresh food range in a North Yorkshire store comprising 35 products and the first ‘regional’ bread made from local flour and sold in stores in Yorkshire, Wessex and East Anglia. Whilst ECRA considered it to be very positive that the supermarket chain was stocking such products, there was no mention in the CSR report or on the company’s website (www.morrisons.co.uk) of planned future targets to increase the stocking of local products. (ref: 134)

Criticised for policy on lightbulb stocking (August 2007)

Greenpeace criticised Morrisons in summer 2007 for the stocking of incandescent bulbs in its stores. According to Greenpeace, there was no justifiable reason why such “energy wasting” products should still be on sale and argued that retailers had a responsibility to remove such products from their shelves. Morrisons was awarded an ‘F’ rating (the top being an A) in the Greenpeace survey. The survey had asked retailers for their commitment to a specific date for a complete phase-out of energy inefficient incandescent bulbs and also rated companies on the proportion of energy efficient to wasteful bulbs and the price of energy efficient bulbs. Morrisons was one of four companies which, at the time, either had no commitment to phase-out bulbs, or had commitment for post 2012. (ref: 135)

Pollution & Toxics

No policy on reduction of use of pesticides and chemicals (2008)

Wm Morrison did not reply to an email request by ECRA, in October 2008, for the company’s policy on reduction of pesticide and chemical use. No mention of such a policy could be found on the company’s website (www.morrisons.co.uk) when it was

searched in the same month. The only mention of pesticides was in Morrisons Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2008, which mentioned that all the company’s fresh produce suppliers were accredited to the EUREPGAP standard. The report stated that EUREPGAP “independently monitor growers’ control and use of pesticides.” However, the EUREPGAP accreditation did not require targets to be set for the reduction of pesticide use, rather, it just monitored the safe handling of such chemicals. As a result, ECRA did not consider that Morrisons was making moves to identify and reduce the use of pesticides and chemicals of concern used on its fresh produce. (ref: 134)

Habitats & Resources

(See also ‘Palm oil policy’ in Climate Change above.)

Failure to act on environment and palm oil (2005)

According to the October 2005 issue of ENDS Report, Morrisons was said to be a major international user of palm oil in its products. Despite this, it was said to have failed to respond to enquiries about its use of palm oil and declined to join an international round table established by environmental groups and multinational companies to address environmental concerns about palm oil production. Felling of Malaysian and Indonesian rainforests to grow oil palms was said to be threatening the existence of a number of endangered species, including orang utans. (ref: 9)

Animals

Animal Testing

Worst ECRA rating for animal testing policy (2008)

According to the 11th Edition of Naturewatch’s Compassionate Shopping Guide, Morrison’s did not have a fixed cut-off date with regards to animal testing, nor did it have a five year rolling rule. In addition it sold non-own brand products made by companies which were known by ECRA to actively test their products on animals. The company therefore received ECRA’s worst rating for animal testing policy. (ref: 128)

Retailed products that had been tested on animals (2005)

For the purposes of rating supermarkets in the November/December 2005 edition of Ethical Consumer, it was assumed that Morrisons retailed products that had been tested on animals. (ref: 137)

Criticism of animal testing policy (2005)

According to the summer 2005 issue of BUAV Campaign Report, Wm Morrison had informed BUAV that it did not conduct or commission animal tests for its own brand household products, but that it did not operate a fixed cut off date, which BUAV stated meant that the company could still be buying in products recently tested on animals. (ref: 43)

Factory farming

Sold factory farmed meat (2008)

According to the 2008 WM Morrison CSR report, the company sold some meat that was not labelled as organic or free range. According to the report, the duck meat it sold came from free range ducks, and it did sell some free range and organic chicken. However, it also mentioned that it had “the smallest price difference” between its own-brand RSPCA Freedom Foods range and “our regular own-brand range, making it affordable for everyone.” It was therefore assumed that some of the meat on sale in Morrisons came from factory farmed animals. (ref: 134)

Animal Rights

Sale of products containing slaughterhouse by-products (2008)

During a search of the company’s website (www.morrisons.co.uk) in October 2008, ECRA found that the company sold a range of products which ECRA considered likely to contain slaughterhouse by-products including rennet, animal fat and gelatine. (ref: 138)

(See also 'Sold factory farmed meat' in **Factory farming** above.)

People

Human Rights

(See also 'Palm oil policy' in **Climate Change** above.)

Workers' Rights

Poor UK working conditions (2007)

According to an article dated 15th August 2007 on the Guardian newspaper website www.guardian.co.uk, in summer 2007 Morrisons was one of two British supermarkets accused of failing to scrutinise its supply chains. The accusations resulted from the discovery of illegal Bulgarian workers at one of the company's fruit and vegetable suppliers who had allegedly been forced to live in unsanitary and cramped conditions, were fed on scavenged food and had their pay withheld by gangmasters for over a month. The gangmaster concerned was said to have had their license revoked earlier in the year but to have been allowed to wind up its business at the time when the abused workers were discovered. (ref: 139)

Poor conditions in South African supplier farms (February 2009)

The War on Want report 'Sour Grapes: South African wine workers and British supermarket power', published in February 2009, stated that the UK government's Competition Commission report of April 2008 found that "supermarkets have used their buying power to squeeze suppliers by transferring risk and costs onto them". Suppliers were reported to be hesitant to speak out against supermarkets in case they were removed from the supermarket's list of suppliers.

Specific problems noted in relation to South African producers were the fact that it was rare for suppliers to have formal contracts, leading to the potential of being de-listed at short notice; supermarkets changing their costs and prices as they liked to suit their needs, and last minute order cancellations without compensation. South African producers were said not to receive assured prices, so there was no guarantee that they could cover their costs. Delays in payment for orders were said to be common, with 120-day long delays becoming increasingly so. Discounts offered by supermarkets were said to be often passed on to suppliers, through pressure to 'promote' the products. Supermarkets were also said to charge for good positioning on the shelf: from £15,000 to £100,000. In addition, it was stated that supermarkets often press suppliers to enter into exclusivity agreements with them, so that the suppliers were entirely dependent on one customer.

The report claimed that "it is the South African workers who pay the price for UK supermarket power and greed." Issues related to this were said to be: sacking workers; lack of formal employment contracts and low wages. The trend towards employing seasonal workers who had no benefits was said to be increasing: in 1995 the ratio of seasonal workers to permanent workers was about equal; by 2000 it was 65%:35%. This was said to reduce the ability of the workers to organise. Women were said to be more vulnerable as a result of the worsening working conditions of workers, to be paid lower wages than men, and to be frequently subjected to sexual harassment at work.

Morrisons was named as one of the largest importers of South African wine, with a 9% share of all sales. (ref: 63)

Accused by union of sex discrimination regarding redundancies (8 November 2005)

In a press release on its website (www.gmb.org.uk), dated 08/11/05, the GMB Union alleged that Morrisons had discriminated against the women employees that it was sacking. Following the company's takeover of Safeway supermarkets Morrisons planned widespread redundancies from various former Safeway depot and

admin sites. After trades union intervention, the company agreed to a national redundancy plan to give enhanced redundancy pay to the (mostly male) depot workers due to loose their jobs in 2006. The GMB stated that Morrisons refused to cover its South Shields administration site in this agreement, where 175 (mostly female) admin staff were due to lose their jobs on Christmas Eve. Therefore, a 39 year old admin worker in South Shields, with ten years service would leave with 10 weeks pay of about £250 per week. A depot worker in Kent of the same age and service would get 26 weeks pay plus £1000. This works out at exactly three times the rate a sacked South Shields worker would get. (ref: 140)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (July 2009)

In order to rate a company's supply chain policy (also referred to as code of conduct, code of practice, supplier policy and various other synonymous terms), ECRA needs to see a copy of the document that is communicated to workers. This is because workers have a right to know the conditions under which the companies are expecting them to work, so that the workers can use this information to press for improvements.

In May/June 2009, Morrison's were contacted by ECRA and a copy of the company's supply chain policy was requested. The company did not respond to the request. The company website was searched (www.morrisons.co.uk) on 10th July 2009, and the Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2008/2009 document was downloaded. This document included information about the company's "supply chain integrity". It stated that the company used Fair Working Conditions to perform social audits in the supply chain. FWC was said to have a unique approach in that, as part of the auditing process, the organisation conducted a secret ballot with workers in which workers were asked if their employer should or should not pass the social audit. The report also referred to the company's Ethical Trading Code, however, advanced internet searches did not reveal the code and it did not form part of the report, so it could not be assessed. Therefore, the company received ECRA's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 130)

Irresponsible Marketing

Named in tobacco price fixing allegations (2008)

According to the Sky News Website on Monday 28th April, 2008 (viewed by ECRA on 08/05/2008) eleven leading supermarkets, including Morrisons and Safeway, were named in a report on tobacco price fixing by the Office of Fair Trading. The OFT had been investigating alleged deals between two tobacco firms - Imperial tobacco and Gallaher - and 11 retailers. The claims related to the alleged collusion of the eleven firms on the wholesale price of cigarettes and the gap in retail prices between different brands. The offences spanned a three year period from 2000. John Fingleton, chief executive of the OFT said "if proven, the alleged practices would amount to a serious breach of the law." Sky business correspondent Joel Hills said: "Imperial tobacco and Gallaher account for over 80% of the cigarette market in the UK. (ref: 55)

Fine for selling "gone off" fish (2008)

According to Ethical Performance Volume 9 Issue 8 Morrisons had been fined for selling fish that had gone off, from its store in Malvern. The supermarket was said to have been found guilty by Worcester Magistrates of two offences under the Food Safety Act 1990 in a case brought after a customer complained about the freshness of fish purchased from the store. It was fined a total of £19,500 plus costs of £2,135.

Trading Standards investigators found a sample of cod taken in November 2006 contained almost four times the level of Total Volatile Nitrogen (TVN) considered acceptable. (ref: 141)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No GM policy (2008)

Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc did not respond to a request by ECRA, in October 2008, for the company's policy on GMOs. ECRA could find no mention of such a policy in the Morrisons 2008 CSR report, nor on the company's website (www.morrisons.co.uk) when it was searched in October 2008. It was therefore assumed that the company did not hold such a policy and that it was likely that the company was selling products which contained GMOs or selling animal products which had been produced with animal feed containing GM ingredients. (ref: 134)

No policy on genetic engineering (2008)

ECRA made a search of the Morrisons website (www.morrisons.co.uk) in June 2008, for a copy of the company's policy on Genetic Engineering. There was mention of the development of GM-free biodegradable packaging in the company's Corporate Social Responsibility Report, but no policy on the sale of goods containing GM products or their derivatives could be found. (ref: 142)

Criticised for likelihood of GM ingredients in products (2006)

According to the Greenpeace Shoppers Guide to GM, viewed on the Greenpeace UK website on 7th September 2006, the following products had been given the 'red' rating applied to "food which may contain GM ingredients or be derived from animals fed on GM crops": Morrison's beef, chicken, lamb, pork, eggs and milk and dairy products. (ref: 143)

Anti-Social Finance

(See also 'Poor conditions in South African supplier farms' in Workers' Rights above.)

Allegations of unlawful practices linked to tobacco prices (April 2008)

According to an article which appeared on the BBC news website on the 25th of April 2008, the Office of Fair Trading (OFT) had alleged that tobacco firms and supermarkets had been engaged in unlawful practices linked to retail prices for tobacco. Allegations were that retailers and tobacco groups had arranged to swap information on future pricing, and that there was an understanding that the price of some brands would be linked to rival brands. Safeway and Morrisons were two of the companies named by the OFT. (ref: 98)

NatureDiet Dog Food

Owned by NatureDiet Pet Foods

NatureDiet Pet Foods, Naturediet Pet Foods, Airfield Ind. Estate, Mile Road, Shipdham, Norfolk, IP25 7SD

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst Ethical Consumer rating for environmental reporting (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the NatureDiet website, www.naturediet.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 145)

Animals

Factory farming

Sale of non-free range meat (January 2010)

NatureDiet's range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.naturediet.co.uk, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, had meat as a major ingredient. The meat used by the company did

not appear to be organic or free range. (ref: 145)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of non-free range meat' in Factory farming above.)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the NatureDiet website, www.naturediet.co.uk, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 145)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No policy on GM on company website (January 2010)

There was no GM policy apparent on the NatureDiet, www.naturediet.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. As the company sold pet food containing both grain and meat it was likely that, in the absence of such a policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil

Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 145)

OrganiPets Complete Organic Cat Food [O]

Owned by OrganiPets Limited

OrganiPets Limited, Sales Director, Unit 12, Standingford House, Cave Street,, Oxford, OX4 1BA

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best Ethical Consumer rating for environmental reporting (October 2009)

OrganiPets responded to Ethical Consumers' questionnaire in October 2009 with a link to its environmental policy which stated the following 'Our aim as a company is to provide the best food possible for our cats and dogs whilst treating the environment with the utmost respect and as responsibly as possible.' It then detailed its specific policies as follows:

Reducing food miles

'To achieve our environmental aims we purchase as many of our raw materials as locally as possible with the vast majority coming from the UK with some even grown on the site where production takes place.'

UK manufactured recyclable packaging

'We purchase our packaging from a UK-based supplier rather than purchasing from the Far East as many companies do. OrganiPets' packaging is also recyclable.'

Organic

'As an organic product we do not use any pesticides or fertilisers in the production of our organic ingredients and avoid artificial

colours preservatives and additives. All our organic ingredients are either accredited by The Soil Association or Organic Farmers and Growers. Our production process is also accredited by The Soil Association.

Responsible office policies

OrganiPets runs a strict recycling programme within our office, recycling paper, cardboard and plastic and trying to keep the use of these to a minimum as well as operating our logistics as efficiently as possible.

Why we only produce environmentally friendly dry food

OrganiPets only produces dry food as wet dog and cat foods are typically made up of 80% water. It seems an environmental nonsense to transport tins or sachets which are predominantly made of water when there is no good reason to do so since dry food technology has approved so much in the last decade. Imagine, that 80% of a lorry or, even worse, a sea container filled with wet pet food is actually just shipping water around the planet. OrganiPets, as a dry pet food has a much lower moisture content and also a much longer best before date when opened. If you wish to add additional moisture just add water to the food when served! A wet food once opened will go off literally in a matter of hours whilst OrganiPets is good for 12 months from date of manufacture whether the packaging has been opened or not.

According to its questionnaire response the company had a turnover of under £5 million. As a small company providing an environmental alternative i.e. only selling organic products and with a credible environmental policy the company received Ethical Consumer's best rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 146)

Animals

Animal Rights

Sale of organic meat (October 2009)

OrganiPets responded to Ethical Consumers' questionnaire in October 2009 with the following statement: 'We use free-range organic chicken certified by the accreditation body, Organic Farmers and Growers. As it is certified as organic this ensures the welfare standards of the free-range chickens is high.' (ref: 146)

People

Supply Chain Policy

Worst Ethical Consumer rating for supply chain policy (October 2009)

OrganiPets responded to Ethical Consumers' request for a copy of its supply chain policy in October 2009 with the following statement: 'It is OrganiPets policy to source from local, organic sources wherever possible with all but a small quantity of our ingredients being produced in the UK with some even grown on the production site. Our recyclable packaging is also sourced from the UK, rather than importing from the Far East, which is common and usually the cheaper option. As we source all our ingredients from the UK and other EU member countries there is no exploitation of workers rights as they are all governed by sound European Government protection.' However, this did not adequately guarantee protection of workers rights in OrganiPets supply chain as workers rights violations are known to occur in the UK and EU, particularly in the meat industry where employers take advantage of vulnerable, often migrant workers with few employment options. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 146)

Politics

Company Ethos

Organic company (October 2009)

According to its response to Ethical Consumer's questionnaire received in October 2009, OrganiPets' sold only organic products and its organic ingredients were accredited by a combination of The Soil Association and Organic Farmers and Growers. (ref: 146)

Product sustainability

Organic product

Certified organic product (October 2009)

According to its response to Ethical Consumer's questionnaire received in October 2009, OrganiPets' organic ingredients were accredited by a combination of The Soil Association and Organic Farmers and Growers. (ref: 146)

Pero Dog Food

Owned by Pero (Foods Ltd)

Pero (Foods) Ltd, Llawr Ynys, Betws y Coed, Conway, LL25 0PZ, Wales

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst Ethical Consumer rating for environmental reporting (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the Pero website, www.pero-petfood.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. Although the company sold organic petfood which Ethical Consumer would consider an environmental alternative, and according to Companies House was a small company exempt from filing accounts, the company also sold non organic meat products. The meat industry has a high environmental impact and Ethical Consumer would expect some kind of environmental policy or report from any company not solely involved in providing environmental or social alternatives. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 147)

Animals

Factory farming

Sale of non-free range meat (January 2010)

Pero's range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.pero-petfood.com, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, included, as well as organic petfood, non-organic meat based offerings which did not appear to use free range meat. (ref: 147)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of non-free range meat' in Factory farming above.)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Pero website, www.pero-petfood.co.uk, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 147)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No GM policy on company website (January 2010)

There was no GM policy apparent on the Pero website, www.pero-petfood.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. Although the company sold organic petfood which would be guaranteed GM free, it also sold non-organic petfood, only

some of which was marketed as being GM free. It was likely therefore that, in the absence of such a policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 147)

Sainsbury's Cat Food

Owned by J Sainsbury plc

J Sainsbury plc, 33 Holborn, London, EC1N 2HT, UK

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for Environmental Report (January 2010)

J Sainsbury's latest CSR Report, dated 2009, was found by ECRA on the company website, www.j-sainsbury.co.uk, in January 2010. It contained a range of dated, quantified targets in a range of different areas, including reductions in CO2 emissions and water use. It also contained updates of progress made against previously set targets.

However, there was no mention of measures to tackle the company's dependence on customer car use. Therefore the report did not show a reasonable understanding of the company's main environmental impacts as a supermarket. No mention was made of whether the report had been independently verified and therefore the company received a middle ECRA rating for its environmental report. (ref: 148)

Average independent rating on CSR in supermarkets (November 2006)

Ethical Performance November 2006 reported that Sainsbury received an average rating (rated as a 'C') in a report by the National Consumer Council on supermarkets progress on corporate responsibility. The rating covered supermarkets progress on CSR factors including: commitment to stocking seasonal food and organics, sustainable sourcing policies and attempts at cutting waste. (ref: 34)

Climate Change

Policy on stocking local produce 2008 (2008)

Sainsbury's did not respond to a request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company's policy on stocking local produce. The company's 2008 Corporate Responsibility report made some statements about stocking British produce, including that all counter beef and lamb in Scotland, Wales, the West Country and Northern Ireland was regionally sourced, as well as 100% of the fresh beef sold in the company's nine Northern Ireland stores had been sourced, processed and packaged locally. Sainsbury's also mentioned its "Supply Something New" scheme which attempted to make it easier for small and medium suppliers to introduce their products to the company. Whilst ECRA saw this as a positive move, the company had not quoted how much of its sales came from local produce, nor set any targets to increase them. (ref: 149)

Average independent rating for environmental performance (November 2006)

The National Consumer Council's 2006 report on supermarkets awarded Sainsbury's a C rating (E) for its environmental performance (showing potential). The report looked at a number of different areas including food transport, waste, nature, and sustainable farming. These were assessed as follows:

D (room for improvement) on food transport issues. Only 59% of its in-season veg was sourced from the UK according to the survey. It was awarded C for waste and a B for its fish policies and stocking. It scored C for trees as a quarter of its kitchenware was FSC certified. Additionally, it scored B for sustainable farming as it stocked the highest percentage of organic options in the surveyed food categories. It also had a stated policy to publish its pesticide residues data. (ref: 131)

Habitats & Resources

Failure to address concerns on palm oil (2005) (DO I NEED TO UPDATE THIS?)

According to the October 2005 issue of ENDS Report, Sainsbury's was said to be a major international user of palm oil in its products. Despite this, it was said to have failed to respond to enquiries about its use of palm oil and declined to join an international round table established by environmental groups and multinational companies to address environmental concerns about palm oil production. Felling of Malaysian and Indonesian rainforests to grow oil palms was said to be threatening the existence of a number of endangered species, including orang utans. (ref: 9)

Timber sourcing policy (2008)

In response to ECRA's request for the company's timber sourcing policy, Sainsbury's sent their 'Paper, Pulp and Timber Sourcing Policy Statement,' which read: "Our aim is that all timber and wood fibre used should originate from forests where there is full legal and verifiable title to the land used, that its management is environmentally and socially sustainable and no materials are taken from areas of High Conservation Value Forestry, or areas of significant conflict. Recycled wood fibre has a major part to play in ensuring sustainable use of the world's forests and preference will be given to use of recycled fibre alongside independent third party certified virgin forest products.' Sainsbury's stated that its preferred certification scheme was the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). Sainsbury's also mentioned using an independent third party certification to verify that products from certified forests were not mixed with products from uncertified forests at any point in the supply chain. It called this 'chain of custody certification,' although it did not state whether or not it was currently using the process or for how much of its supply chain. Sainsbury's noted that it was the first supermarket chain to convert all its own-brand household tissues (toilet roll, kitchen roll and tissues) to exclusively FSC certified (for virgin material) and 100% recycled content. (ref: 150)

Animals

Animal Testing

Animal testing policy (October 2008)

According to its response to an ECRA questionnaire received in October 2008, Sainsbury's was against animal testing and demonstrated its commitment to this through the following:

No Sainsbury's own brand cosmetic or toiletry product has been tested on animals. In addition, no raw materials used in the manufacture of Sainsbury's own brand cosmetic or toiletry products can have been tested on animals by or on behalf of Sainsbury's, since its cut-off date of 1998.

No Sainsbury's own brand household product has been tested on animals. In addition, no raw materials used in the manufacture of Sainsbury's own household products can have been tested on animals by or on behalf of Sainsbury's, within the last 5 years. It stated that the company was in the process of reviewing this policy with a view to tightening it by introducing a cut-off date.

On pets food it stated the following: Animals are used to test own label petfood for flavour, preference and palatability in a similar way to the human taste panels we use for food ranges. Its policy does not permit any invasive testing of animals. The animals

used to test the palatability of petfood must be kept in a healthy environment, managed by our suppliers, and we do not permit any establishment that carries out any form of invasive animal testing to house or care for these animals. In addition to these policies Sainsbury's stated it also financially supported the Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME), whose scientists develop new non animal-based tests to satisfy UK and EU safety and legal requirements for new products.

It went on to state that these policies ensure that where it has influence (i.e. those companies within its own supply chain and Sainsbury's own brand products), animal testing is not carried out. However it claimed not to have any direct influence outside of its own supply chain and therefore was not in a position to stop other companies (e.g. the suppliers of branded cosmetics) from carrying out animal testing. (ref: 150)

Criticism of animal testing policy for household products (2005)

According to the summer 2005 issue of BUAV Campaign Report, J Sainsbury had informed BUAV that it did not conduct or commission animal tests for its own brand household products, but that it did not operate a fixed cut off date, which BUAV stated meant that the company could still be buying in products recently tested on animals. (ref: 43)

Factory farming

Animal Welfare Policy (2008)

Sainsbury's did not respond to a written request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company's animal welfare policy. The company's website www.j-sainsbury.co.uk, viewed by ECRA in November 2008, stated that Sainsbury's aimed to extend its higher welfare standards for chickens to frozen and processed lines, commencing 2011. It said that it had introduced a new range of Freedom Foods chicken which meant that "nearly a third" of its own-brand chicken would be higher welfare. It also stated that all its shell eggs would be 'cage-free' by 2012 and that it had "gradually reduced" the proportion of caged eggs in its processed products over the past 12 months, adding that all its "Taste the difference", "Supernaturals" and "Kids" ranges used free-range eggs. However, the website stated that the company sold two ranges of chicken - "Fresh British" and "Sainsbury's Basics" that were not labelled as Freedom Food, free-range or organic standard. Additionally, the company made no mention of free-range or organic certification of other types of meat it sold. As a result, ECRA considered it likely that some of these meat products had come from factory farmed animals and the company received a negative mark in this category. (ref: 149)

Sold factory farmed pig meat (June 2006)

According to Supermarkets & Farm Animal Welfare 'Raising the Standard' published by the Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) Trust in 2006, Sainsbury's was still selling pig meat under its own label that was imported from stall systems. In these systems, sows were confined in narrow stalls and were unable to turn round or exercise during their pregnancy. Sow stalls had been banned in the UK on cruelty grounds. 70% of the pig meat sold by Sainsbury's was from the offspring of mothering sows kept in narrow farrowing crates. (ref: 84)

Low rating for animal welfare standards (January 2006)

According to the Food Magazine (Issue 72, Jan/Mar 2006), Sainsbury's was one of four UK supermarkets that had shown 'poorer results' in research carried out by Compassion in World Farming for its 'Compassionate Supermarket of the Year' Awards. (ref: 151)

Animal Rights

Products contained unexpected animal derived ingredients (March 2009)

In March 2009 The Food Magazine reported that Sainsbury's

Chocolate Trifle contained pork gelatine, a slaughterhouse by-product, but that the product was not labelled as 'unsuitable for vegetarians'. (ref: 15)

Stocked products containing animal by-products (2008)

During a search of the company's website (www.j-sainsbury.co.uk) in November 2008, ECRA found that the company sold a range of products which ECRA considered likely to contain slaughterhouse by-products including rennet, animal fat and gelatine. (ref: 152)

(See also 'Animal Welfare Policy' in Factory farming above.)

People

Human Rights

Sale of products from illegal settlements (2006)

According to a July 2006 report by War on Want, Sainsbury was one of several supermarkets which sold products such as Soda Stream items made in the illegal settlement of Mishor Adumim. Settlements were described as an appropriation of land, illegal under international law, which in the West Bank was often associated with violence and threats against Palestinian residents by the Israeli army and by armed settlers. (ref: 153)

Criticism over cotton supply chain for 'I'm not a plastic bag' (28 April 2007)

According to the Independent newspaper's website (www.independent.co.uk), viewed on 1st May 2007, an article published on 28th April 2007 detailed criticisms of Sainsbury's. The company had launched a one-off designer bag-for-life with the words "I'm not a plastic bag" on it, to encourage customers to use less plastic bags. However, it was said that the bag was made in China, a country on ECRA's list of oppressive regimes at the time of writing. The cotton it was made from was said to be non-fair trade cotton.

The article stated that Sainsbury's had checked the factory in China was not exploiting local workers. However, it was said that Labour Behind the Label had challenged Sainsbury's to make public the name of its supplier and its audit report, claiming that there is "no way" that items can be produced ethically in China. The Let's Clean Up Fashion campaign were said to state that garment workers in China were paid 20p to 30p per hour and that labour laws were not enforced, independent trade unions were illegal and also that the ETI stated that audits in China were open to fraud. The campaign was also said to highlight the large amounts of pesticides used in the production of conventional cotton.

The company also rebuffed criticisms of the bag's carbon footprint, it was said to state that the bags were transported by sea and CO2 emissions were offset. (ref: 154)

Workers' Rights

Fine for workplace accident (2006)

According to the January-March 2006 issue of Hazards, Sainsbury's had been convicted of safety offences and was fined £10,000 and ordered to pay costs of £11,040 after a bakery manager slipped on a wet floor and suffered neck and back injuries. (ref: 155)

Migrant workers housed in 'squalid' conditions (2008)

According to a report published in May 2009 by the Ecumenical Council for Corporate Responsibility, in August 2008 a farmer in Scotland who supplied Sainsbury's was investigated by the Gangmasters' Licensing Authority and other agencies for housing migrants, mainly from Bulgaria, in 'squalid' conditions. (ref: 156)

Investigation into fruit picking conditions (2006)

According to the August 2006 issue of Labour Research, in summer 2006 Tesco and Sainsbury's had announced that they would be investigating working conditions at S&A Produce, a supplier to both companies and one of the UK's largest strawberry

growers. The move followed demonstrations after revelations about conditions at the company, which were said to include working days of up to 14 hours, with just half an hour's break, charges made of East European workers for accessing basic health services, and refusal of healthcare until fees were paid upfront. Working weeks of 6 or 7 days were also said to be enforced, in breach of contracts specifying 5 days, and workers were said to be housed in cramped and insanitary conditions. (ref: 157)

Supply Chain Policy

Middle ECRA rating for supply chain policy (January 2010)

According to the FAQs section of the www.j-sainsbury.com website, viewed on January 22nd 2010, the company's code focuses on:

- * Fair terms of trading
- * Protection of children
- * Health and safety
- * Equal opportunities
- * Freedom of association
- * Freedom of employment
- * Remuneration.

Although we emailed the company to ask for a copy of the code, in the absence of clear prohibitions on excessive hours, a living wage and anti-discrimination - and in the absence of independent monitoring - the company could only receive a middle rating in this ECRA category. (ref: 158)

No real effort to apply living wage (2009)

The Labour Behind the Label report "Let's Clean Up Fashion – 2009 update" gave companies grades from zero to five to indicate how far along the route towards implementing a living wage they were. Sainsbury's received a grade 2, which was defined in the report as meaning the company "acknowledges that minimum and industry benchmark wages are not sufficient standards, but no real efforts to apply living wage." The authors of the report commented that "as with last year, Sainsbury's have failed to supply any concrete information about their work." (ref: 159)

Membership of ETI (2008)

According to the Ethical Trading Initiative website (www.ethicaltrade.org), viewed by ECRA in November 2008, Sainsbury's was listed as a member. Once companies have been accepted as members, they should adopt the ETI Base Code of Conduct and implement it into their supply chains. Progress reports on code implementation, and on improvements to labour practices, were required. (ref: 53)

Irresponsible Marketing

Named in tobacco price fixing allegation (2008)

According to the Sky News Website on Monday 28th April, 2008 (viewed by ECRA on 08/05/2008) eleven leading supermarkets, including Sainsbury, were named in a report on tobacco price fixing by the Office of Fair Trading. The OFT had been investigating alleged deals between two tobacco firms - Imperial Tobacco and Gallaher - and 11 retailers. The claims related to the alleged collusion of the eleven firms on the wholesale price of cigarettes and the gap in retail prices between different brands. The offences spanned a three year period from 2000. John Fingleton, chief executive of the OFT said "if proven, the alleged practices would amount to a serious breach of the law." Sky business correspondent Joel Hills said: "Imperial Tobacco and Gallaher account for over 80% of the cigarette market in the UK. (ref: 55)

Sale of tobacco products (2007)

The Mintel December 2007 Convenience Retailing Report defined convenience retailers as 'open 7 days a week... and selling an extended range of goods including tobacco products...' Sainsbury

Local was a retailer profiled in this report. (ref: 91)

Misleading labelling of high fat spreads (March 2009)

In March 2009 The Food Magazine reported that Sainsbury's Basics Soft Spread, Freefrom Vegetable Spread and Sunflower Spread were labelled with an 'amber' traffic light, which should have meant that they contained a 'medium' level of saturated fat (between 1.5% and 5%). However, the products were said to have contained high levels of saturated fat (between 9% and 15%). The article stated that manufacturers were allowed to use this misleading claim due to an incongruity in labelling law. Sainsbury's 'So Organic' Olive Spread was said to have contained only 4% olive oil and 55% sunflower oil and palm fat. (ref: 15)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No policy on GM cotton (2009)

In December 2008 Sainsbury's was asked to provide Ethical Consumer with its policy towards genetically modified cotton but no reply was received. A search of the company's corporate website on 23 January 2009 and a relevant page was found from the 2005 CSR report (www.j-sainsbury.com/files/reports/cr2005/index.asp?pageid=52) which stated "Our position on cotton: Most of Sainsbury's cotton products originate from countries that do not use GM cotton seed. The likelihood of GM being present is low. The nature of the global market in cotton makes it difficult to identify precisely where the cotton is grown and we therefore cannot guarantee that any of our products are non-GM." No mention of the issue was made in the company's 2008 CSR report.

Consequently, because Ethical Consumer reported in its January 2006 issue that "cotton grown from genetically modified crops currently accounts for around 35% of the global market," the company received a criticism for selling GM cotton products in the absence of any undertaking that it was avoiding GM cotton. (ref: 160)

GM Policy 2008 (2008)

In response to a written request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company's GM policy, Sainsbury's stated that it did not permit the use of genetically modified crops; ingredients, additives (including process aids and carriers) or derivatives from genetically modified crops, to be used in

Sainsbury's Brand food and drink, pet food, dietary supplements or floral products. The company also stated that it stocked a choice of Sainsbury's brand meat, fish, poultry, milk and eggs which were sourced from livestock which had been fed a diet of non-GM soya and maize proteins. The company's website (www.j-sainsbury.co.uk), viewed by ECRA in November 2008, listed the following products as being fed on non-GM animal feed:

- All its fresh and frozen chicken
- Free-range eggs
- Fresh outdoor-reared pork
- Outdoor reared bacon
- Taste the Difference 21-day matured beef
- Traditional beef

It stated that suppliers of these products must be able to demonstrate that animal feed

ingredients were procured through an identity preserved supply chain, and that traceability must be regularly challenged in order to guarantee no GM ingredients. However, Sainsbury's also stated that it had previously investigated selling only products from animals fed on a non-GM diet, but decided against this due to cost implications for farmers since GM ingredients were not routinely segregated from non-GM ingredients in animal feed supply chains. (ref: 150)

GM material possible in food products (2006)

According to the Greenpeace Shoppers Guide to GM, viewed on the Greenpeace UK website on 7th September 2006, the following products had been given the 'red' rating applied to "food which may contain GM ingredients or be derived from animals fed on GM crops": Sainsbury's beef, lamb, traditional beef, milk/dairy products. (ref: 143)

Anti-Social Finance

Poor conditions in South African supplier farms (February 2009)

The War on Want report 'Sour Grapes: South African wine workers and British supermarket power', published in February 2009, stated that the UK government's Competition Commission report of April 2008 found that "supermarkets have used their buying power to squeeze suppliers by transferring risk and costs onto them". Suppliers were reported to be hesitant to speak out against supermarkets in case they were removed from the supermarket's list of suppliers.

Specific problems noted in relation to South African producers were the fact that it was rare for suppliers to have formal contracts, leading to the potential of being de-listed at short notice; supermarkets changing their costs and prices as they liked to suit their needs, and last minute order cancellations without compensation. South African producers were said not to receive assured prices, so there was no guarantee that they could cover their costs. Delays in payment for orders were said to be common, with 120-day long delays becoming increasingly so. Discounts offered by supermarkets were said to be often passed on to suppliers, through pressure to 'promote' the products. Supermarkets were also said to charge for good positioning on the shelf: from £15,000 to £100,000. In addition, it was stated that supermarkets often press suppliers to enter into exclusivity agreements with them, so that the suppliers were entirely dependent on one customer.

The report claimed that "it is the South African workers who pay the price for UK supermarket power and greed." Issues related to this were said to be: sacking workers; lack of formal employment contracts and low wages. The trend towards employing seasonal workers who had no benefits was said to be increasing: in 1995 the ratio of seasonal workers to permanent workers was about equal; by 2000 it was 65%:35%. This was said to reduce the ability of the workers to organise. Women were said to be more vulnerable as a result of the worsening working conditions of workers, to be paid lower wages than men, and to be frequently subjected to sexual harassment at work.

Sainsbury's was named as one of the largest importers of South African wine, with a 12% share of all sales. (ref: 63)

Allegations of unlawful practices linked to tobacco prices (April 2008)

According to an article which appeared on the BBC news website on the 25th of April 2008, the Office of Fair Trading (OFT) had alleged that tobacco firms and supermarkets had been engaged in unlawful practices linked to retail prices for tobacco. Allegations were that retailers and tobacco groups had arranged to swap information on future pricing, and that there was an understanding that the price of some brands would be linked to rival brands. Sainsbury was one of the companies named by the OFT. (ref: 98)

Criticised for unfair treatment of suppliers (2006)

According to the website of the Forum for Private Business, an organisation representing small businesses in the UK, viewed by ECRA in June 2006, at that time Sainsbury was named as one of the companies in the 'Hall of Shame.' It was said to have been the subject by a crackdown by the Office of Fair Trading after trying to impose "harsh new payment terms" on suppliers. (ref: 161)

Tesco Cat Food

Owned by Tesco plc

Tesco plc, Tesco House, Delamare Road, Cheshunt, Waltham Cross, Herts, EN8 9SL, UK

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for environment report (July 2009)

In May/June 2009, ECRA wrote to Tesco asking for a copy of the company's environment report. The company did not reply. The company's Corporate Responsibility Report 2009 was downloaded in July 2009. Only some of the environmental data was independently audited. The auditor was ERM. At least 2 dated, future, quantifiable targets were included. Meaningful carbon disclosure was included. Information on transport, environmental issues relating to stores, energy use, water use, packaging reduction, other waste issues and sustainability issues relating to specific animals (eg fish stocks) was included. However, there was no information on pesticide use. At the time of writing, the business was dependent on customer car use. The report mentioned that the company's US stores had parking spaces for hybrid cars and bikes, but this was not deemed by ECRA to be a sufficient response to the myriad of problems caused by Tesco-related customer car use. Indeed the report cited the company's involvement in the creation of town centre parking as a positive step. For these reasons, ECRA gave Tesco its middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 162)

Poor independent rating on CSR in supermarkets (November 2006)

The National Consumer Council's 2006 report on supermarkets awarded Tesco a poor overall rating (D) for its environmental performance. The report looked at a number of different areas including food transport, waste, nature and sustainable farming. These were assessed as follows:

D (room for improvement) on food transport issues. 61% of its in-season vegetables were UK sourced and the helpline was described as "particularly unhelpful". It showed potential for its waste, but only scored a D for its fish stocking and E for its trees policy as only 5% of its wooden kitchenware was FSC certified. It scored C for its organics stocking. (ref: 131)

Other publication critical of CSR report (April 2005)

A CSR Network Press Release dated 18 April 2005 stated that Tesco's Corporate Responsibility Review 2003/04 looked impressive, but had some clear gaps. The press release stated that Tesco's report only covered the UK in any systematic way, despite over £6bn of Tesco's sales being outside the UK, including countries where legislation on environmental and social issues was far less stringent. The release went on to state that commendably the report did contain information on Tesco's approach to ethical trading, but that there was no information on the results of audits, how many problems were identified and what had happened since. (ref: 163)

Climate Change

Palm oil, use of non-CSPO (July 2009)

In May/June 2009, Tesco was contacted by ECRA and a copy of its palm oil policy was requested. The company did not reply. A search was made of the company website (www.tescocorporate.com) on 10th July 2009. The site stated that the company had a target of sourcing all "palm derived ingredients from certified sustainable oil" by 2015, but did not state that Tesco was already using Certified Sustainably Palm Oil. The palm oil supplier was not specified, neither was the country of origin. At the time of writing, most CSPO had had to be sold as normal palm oil, due to poor take up of CSPO amongst companies, many of whom

were members of the RSPO. Therefore, due to the fact that the company did not communicate to ECRA (either directly or through its publicly-available documents) that it sourced CSPO or bought Greenpalm certificate or any other meaningful alternative, the company received negative marks for impacts on climate change, habitat destruction and endangered species (orang utans and Sumatran tigers). (ref: 164)

High carbon score in 2008 (October 2008)

According to the October 2008 issue of the ENDS Report, Tesco had a high carbon disclosure score. The table listed the 5 highest scoring companies in carbon-intensive sectors and the 6 highest scoring companies in non-carbon-intensive sectors. The company was fifth in the non-carbon-intensive list. The table only listed companies in the FTSE 350, the information was for the year 2008. (ref: 165)

Misleading ethical claims (2007)

According to the May 2007 edition of the Ecologist, Tesco had committed to some environmental improvements, but these did not address its real environmental impacts.

1) Tesco had committed to halving by 2010 the average energy use in all its buildings. The article pointed out that this made good business sense as the world was facing oil shortages, and the contradiction that Tesco's whole business plan involved people driving to out of town shops. 2) Secondly, Tesco had a stated aim to double the amount of waste sent for recycling at its stores, but had not addressed the unnecessary packaging of products.

3) Tesco had committed to cutting the number of bags given out by a third, and to make them biodegradable. The article said Delhi in India and Bangladesh had banned plastic bags, and that technology on biodegradable bags had been available for decades.

4) Tesco had pursued its own labelling of healthy food scheme which Which? had said was 'more of a hindrance than a help.'

5) Tesco's well-publicised initiatives to sponsor school and sports events were criticised as low-cost 'cause-related marketing.' The retailer did not publicise how much money you had to spend to receive equipment, but the article said shoppers had to spend: £250,000 to receive a mid-range computer, £1140 to receive a pack of three tennis balls, £840 for a pair of plastic inflatable arm bands, £2200 for a football, £2360 for a hockey stick and £1million for a trampoline.

6) Tesco's community consultation on building new stores was also criticised, especially as Chief Executive Terry Leahy had said he would seek out a 'favourable silent minority in favour of a store if a community did reject Tesco's plans to build one.'

7) The company's plans to increase sourcing of local and regional British foods was also questioned. Tesco had outmanoeuvred powerful international food companies regarding terms, so what chance did small local suppliers have? Smaller suppliers could be trapped into dependence on single large contracts. (ref: 166)

Pollution & Toxics

Sale of PVC goods (July 2007)

A search of the Tesco shopping website Tesco Direct (direct.tesco.com) viewed on 27th July 2007 found a number of goods for sale containing PVC, including a shower curtain, storage box, child's 'wet suit', lounge chair, sports panniers and a rainsuit. PVC had been criticised by environmental campaigners for its negative environmental impact in production, use and disposal. The manufacture and incineration of PVC results in the formation of large quantities of dioxin which can cause cancer and immune, developmental and reproductive systems damage. PVC often contains softeners called phthalates which can leach out of products and are hormone disrupting chemicals. (ref: 167)

Named on Fountain Set (Holding) CSR page (2006)

According to CSR Asia Weekly Vol.2 Week 25, Tesco was amongst a group of brands listed as customers on the Fountain

Sets CSR page.

Fountain Sets (Holding) Limited was a publically listed company in Hong Kong, consisting of 13 companies including Dongguan Fuann Textiles. It was said to have supplied to international retail brands and in 2005 Worldwide sales reached HK\$6.64 billion (US\$851 million).

The South China Morning Post (16th June, 2006) had reported that Dongguan Fuann Textiles had illegally discharged excessive waste water directly into a river by laying a secret pipe through which it piped over 20,000 tonnes a day, nearly equivalent to its total waste water treatment plant's capacity. Fountain Set (Holdings) was facing a fine of up to 500,000 yuan. Dongguan's deputy Mayor Li Yuquan was said to have blamed Dongguan Fuan Textiles for river pollution and said it should be severely punished. (ref: 168)

Policy on stocking organic and Fairtrade produce (2008)

In response to a request by ECRA for the company's policies on stocking organic and Fairtrade produce, Tesco sent the following statement: "We stock a wide range of both products and have helped to grow both markets significantly." However, ECRA did not consider this to constitute a policy, since the company had not mentioned amounts of these products, nor expressed an intention to increase the range of Fairtrade products sold. This put Tesco behind other major supermarkets which had made commitments in these areas. (ref: 169)

Habitats & Resources

(See also 'Palm oil, use of non-CSPO' in Climate Change above.)

Allegations of breached planning rules (2006)

According to a BBC investigation released on 18th August 2006 and covered on the news.bbc.co.uk website, Tesco had been found to have breached planning regulations on some of its stores. A shop in Portwood, Stockport, was found to have been built 20% over the size for which the company had planning consent, and was still said to be open and turning over £1 million a week. At another site in Buckinghamshire a 27,000 tonne pile of waste, taken from an incident when the wall of a new Tesco store collapsed onto a main trainline, was said to have been left on a Site of Outstanding Natural Beauty, despite orders from the council to remove it. The company was said to have claimed that it was trying to rectify the situation in both circumstances, but the journalist who made the original programme was quoted as saying that Tesco stood accused of "dragging out the planning process, challenging enforcement orders, manipulating the planning laws, bending them, and breaking them on occasion." (ref: 170)

Animals

Animal Testing

Worst ECRA rating for animal testing policy (2008)

ECRA made a search of Tesco website, www.tescocorporate.com, on the 15th May 2008 and found the following statement with regard to animal testing: 'We do not support testing on animals for cosmetic or household purposes and therefore do not carry out such tests on our own-brand products or the ingredients in them. Nor does anyone carry out testing for cosmetic or household purposes on our behalf. The EU has set a provisional timetable for banning all animal testing for the purposes of developing new cosmetics. We want to help make this timetable a reality, and are therefore playing our part in funding alternatives to animal testing. As a five-star donor, Tesco contributes £10,000 a year to the Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experimentation (FRAME), which seeks to end animal testing.' Whilst ECRA considered that the contribution to FRAME can be welcomed, the fact that Tesco does not clearly state that it has either a moratorium, five year rolling rule or fixed cut off date for animal tested ingredients implies that while it may not

be conducting or commissioning animal experiments itself the company will almost certainly be using ingredients in its products that have been tested on animals, with no framework for phasing them out. Tesco also retails major-brand animal-tested cosmetics, toiletries and household products. Tesco therefore receives ECRA's worst rating for animal testing. (ref: 171)

Worst ECRA rating for animal testing policy (May 2008)

Dobbies responded to a request by ECRA for a copy of its animal testing policy with the following statement 'To the best of our knowledge none of our beauty products are tested on animals (we have no own brand beauty products). The majority of our products are based on plant extracts and essential oils e.g. lavender, rose, mint orange etc. and a number of products sourced from suppliers are free from things like synthetic fragrances, sodium lauryl sulphate, butylated hydroxyanisole and parabens.' However, this was not considered to constitute an effective animal testing policy given that Dobbies operates in a sector where animal testing is commonplace (garden chemicals are routinely tested on animals), Dobbies therefore receives ECRA's worst rating for animal testing policy. (ref: 172)

Sells products that are tested on animals (2007)

For the purposes of rating supermarkets in EC reports during 2004, ECRA assumed that unless we were informed otherwise, Tesco stocked products that were tested on animals. (ref: 173)

Factory farming

Unsound practices including lack of bio security compliance by Crown Chicken (2008)

According to Hillside Animal Sanctuary Winter 2007/8 newsletter, in May 2007 BBC1's 'Whistleblower' programme revealed unsound practices carried out by Tesco, including selling out of date meat and fish and other 'behind the scenes' health risks, the programme highlighted a complete lack of bio security compliance by Crown Chicken. (ref: 174)

Sale of factory farmed meat and eggs from caged birds (2008)

On its website (www.tescocorporate.com), viewed November 2008, Tesco outlined its position on animal welfare. It stated that it met all legal and industry standards for animal welfare and that it aimed to increase sales of chickens raised with higher welfare standards. However, it did not mention any targets to reduce sale of factory farmed birds or eggs from caged hens. Since the company sold non-organic and non-free range meat and eggs, ECRA considered it likely that these products had come from factory farmed sources. (ref: 175)

No commitment to cage free hens (2007)

According to Farm Animal Voice Winter 2007 Tesco was one of the only supermarkets to have made no commitment on going 'cage free' and eliminating products from battery hens from its stores. (ref: 176)

Animal Rights

Sale of fur products (2005)

According to the April 2005 issue of Advocates for Animals update, Dobbies Garden centres had been found to be selling ornamental toys made with real animal fur. After complaints from customers, the chain was said to have withdrawn the specific toys, but had also told AfA that it had no plans to implement a fur-free policy in its stores. (ref: 177)

(See also 'Sale of factory farmed meat and eggs from caged birds' in Factory farming above.)

Allegations of animal cruelty in Chinese stores (2006)

According to the Tortoise Trust website, in a media release dated 10th June 2006, Tesco sold turtle meat in China. The company was accused of cruelty because, the Tortoise Trust claimed, live animals were kept in the stores and killed at the point of sale. According to the NGO, it was impossible to kill turtles outright

in a humane and edible manner under such conditions because of the animals' ability to withstand low oxygen levels and their reflex to withdraw their heads when afraid. It was also alleged that soft shelled turtles were killed by removing their shells with a knife without killing them in other ways first, effectively meaning that they were skinned alive. (ref: 178)

People

Human Rights

Sale of products from illegal settlements (2006)

According to a July 2006 report by War on Want, Tesco was one of several supermarkets which sold products such as Soda Stream products, Beigal & Beigal snacks and Yarden wines which came from illegal settlements in the West Bank and Golan Heights respectively. Settlements were described as an appropriation of land, illegal under international law, which in the West Bank was often associated with violence and threats against Palestinian residents by the Israeli army and by armed settlers. (ref: 153)

(See also 'Palm oil, use of non-CSPO' in Climate Change above.)

Criticised for workers' rights abuses (2009)

A report published by the Clean Clothes Campaign in February 2009 detailed several workers' rights abuses occurring at Tesco supplier factories in Bangladesh, India, Thailand and Sri Lanka. It accused the factories of forcing workers to do overtime, of at least an hour per day, but only paying them for one or two overtime hours each month. Workers had complained of the poor housing provided by Tesco's supplier and of poor job security caused by the employment of most workers on temporary contracts. Workers also reported being evicted from their jobs if they formed unions and threatened with such action in their call letter. (ref: 179)

Workers' Rights

Child labour in cosmetics supply chain (19 July 2009)

According to an article in on the Times website (www.timesonline.co.uk), dated 19 July 2009, child labour had been found in Tesco's supply chain. It was said that the company sourced mica from S Black, which in turn sourced it from Merck. The article stated that Merck KGaA sourced mica from Jharkhand, India, where child labour was widespread. A local NGO was said to estimate that "tens of thousands of local children may be working in mica mines." It was said that a six year old girl and her eight year old sister were found sifting through stones hoping to earn enough for a meal. The reporter was said to have found 15 other children working in similar situations. One of the workers stated that "If we each earn 50 rupees (63p) in a day then we eat...Sometimes we don't". To earn this amount, workers were said to have to work 12 hours a day. One of the workers stated that "loose earth falls down all the time. Last year one girl was buried". It was not clear whether or not she lived. It was said that the minimum working age in India was 14 but that for mine work, it was 18. It was said that police were bribed to overlook these legal breaches. Several workers mentioned that they scared of getting malaria and snake bites. Other workers stated that they had incurred exhaustion, broken bones and heatstroke.

According to the article, Tesco stated that it would get in touch with suppliers and investigate and that it was taking the matter seriously. Mica is used in the production of some cosmetics. (ref: 180)

(See also 'Criticised for workers' rights abuses' in Human Rights above.)

Failure to pay living wage (June 2008)

According to a story titled 'Tesco 'sweatshop shame' fury' on the War on Want website (www.waronwant.org) dated 26 June 2008, workers making clothes at a factory in India for Tesco were working long hours for as little as 16p per hour. According to the research, employees at a large Tesco supplier factory in

Bangalore were struggling to survive on less than £1.50 a day for a 60-hour week, with a 20 per cent hike in rice prices making life even harder.

Allegedly, employees in the factory earned on average £38 a month, and the lowest paid received just £30, while the Bangalore Garment and Textile Workers' Union had, in 2007, calculated a living wage as at least £52 a month. Employees complained that bosses forced them to work overtime or face the sack and they receive payment for only half the extra hours recorded.

According to the story, workers said the high pressure to produce orders meant they risked dismissal for failing to meet double their normal targets, requesting sick leave or arriving late on two consecutive days. Some employees, fearing the loss of their jobs if they missed targets, skipped lunch and did not drink water in order to reduce the number of times they went to the toilet. The factory did not recognise a trade union. The report stated that some workers feared managers were targeting them for potential firing for their individual union membership, which would flout Tesco's ethical code of conduct. One employee told colleagues about a forthcoming union meeting on a Sunday, the workers' only day off. Bosses then were said to impose compulsory overtime and threatened staff with severe punishment if they failed to work on that day. (ref: 181)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (2009)

In order to rate a company's supply chain policy (also referred to as code of conduct, code of practice, supplier policy and various other synonymous terms), ECRA needs to see a copy of the document that is communicated to workers. This is because workers have a right to know the conditions under which the companies are expecting them to work, so that the workers can use this information to press for improvements. At the time of writing, several ETI-member companies had not fully integrated the ETI Base Code and Principles of Implementation into their supply chain policies, and it had come to ECRA's attention that companies do not have to fulfil this criteria in order to gain membership of the ETI. Indeed, some members stated that their policy was "aligned to"/"based on" the Base Code etc, but examination of the policy revealed that key points from the Base Code were missing.

In May/June 2009, Tesco were contacted by ECRA and a copy of the company's supply chain policy was requested. The company did not respond to the request. The company website was searched (www.tescopl.com) on 7th July 2009, and a the Corporate Responsibility 2009 document was downloaded. This document included information about the company's supply chain policy and Code of Practice, but did not include the Code of Practice, which was highly likely to be the document that was communicated to workers. An advanced internet search did not reveal the Code of Practice.

The Corporate Responsibility document stated "We expect all our suppliers to meet the standards set out under the ETI Base Code and guarantee their workers the rights within it". It then gave a very simplified version of the ETI Base Code. If the company were to be rated on this simplified version of the ETI Base Code, it would have received a middle rating for supply chain policy. However, given what is said above, ECRA could not rate the company without seeing the information communicated to workers. Therefore, the company received worst rating for supply chain policy

Other points to note were that Tesco had an Auditor Recognition Programme, in which the company had quality-controlled the individual 3rd party audit staff it used. Tesco was the chair of the Global Social Compliance Programme, which the Clean Clothes Campaign had stated that it had "strong reservations concerning the value of another initiative in this area" and had

refused to meet with the GSCP partly on this basis. The GSCP was a business-led organisation. (ref: 162)

Membership of ETI (2008)

According to the ETI website www.ethicaltrade.org, visited by ECRA in November 2008, Tesco was listed as a member. For companies to be accepted as members, they were required to adopt the ETI Base Code of Conduct and implement it into their supply chains. Progress reports on code implementation, and on improvements to labour practices was required. (ref: 53)

Supply chain criticism (September 2006)

According to the Labour Behind the Label (LBL) report, "Let's clean up fashion", published in September 2006, LBL had several criticisms of Tesco. The report noted that although the company was working on implementing a living wage methodology in supplier factories, this was only at the level of a few pilot projects. LBL also alleged that the company made no real efforts to make sure that its workers had access to freedom of association and collective bargaining, even though the company had acknowledged that management and worker training was needed in order to achieve access.

LBL also expressed concerns about the lack of robust procedures to monitor and verify that workers rights were being upheld, but also noted that Tesco was a member of the ETI and the Multi Fibre Agreement Forum. The report stated that Tesco had operations in China, which was on ECRA's list of oppressive regimes at the time of writing.

Of particular note is this statement in the report "Riots over wages by workers at a Bangladesh factory supplying Tesco earlier this year [2006] resulted in a worker being killed in clashes with police". (ref: 52)

Irresponsible Marketing

Named in tobacco price fixing allegation (2008)

According to the Sky News Website on Monday 28th April, 2008 (viewed by ECRA on 08/05/2008) eleven leading supermarkets, including Tesco, were named in a report on tobacco price fixing by the Office of Fair Trading. The OFT had been investigating alleged deals between two tobacco firms - Imperial Tobacco and Gallher - and 11 retailers. The claims related to the alleged collusion of the eleven firms on the wholesale price of cigarettes and the gap in retail prices between different brands. The offences spanned a three year period from 2000. John Fingleton, chief executive of the OFT said "if proven, the alleged practices would amount to a serious breach of the law." Sky business correspondent Joel Hills said: "Imperial Tobacco and Gallaher account for over 80% of the cigarette market in the UK. (ref: 55)

Sells tobacco products (2007)

The Mintel December 2007 Convenience Retailing Report defined convenience retailers as 'open 7 days a week... and selling an extended range of goods including tobacco products...' Tesco Express and One Stop was a retailer profiled in this report. (ref: 91)

Unexpected animal derived ingredients (October 2009)

On 3rd October 2009 it was reported in the Mail Online, www.dailymail.co.uk, that Tesco's Plain Tortilla Wraps contained L-cysteine, an ingredient made from pig or other animal hair, which was used to soften the dough. (ref: 182)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

Likely to sell GM cotton (July 2009)

At the time of writing, GM cotton was prevalent in the cotton supply chain. ECRA sent Tesco a questionnaire in May/June 2009, it contained a question about the company's GM policy. The company did not reply. In January 2009, the company had made the following response to the ECRA Clothing Retailers

Questionnaire 2009, “We do not have a specific policy regarding the use of GM cotton, although we continue to monitor the situation.” No mention was made of the company’s policy on GM cotton when its website (tescoplc.com) was searched in July 2009. As it was unlikely that the company’s policy had changed, it continued to receive a negative mark for its lack of a GM-free policy. (ref: 164)

No clear group-wide policy on use of GM (2008)

In response to a request by ECRA in October 2008 for the company’s policy on the use of GM, Tesco stated that it did not sell any own-brand GM foods in the UK and that the use of GM feed was prohibited in its organic products. Since all organic products, not just those sold by Tesco, were produced without GM ingredients or with the use of GM animal feed, this was not considered to constitute part of the company’s anti-GM policy. The company’s website (www.tescocorporate.com), viewed by ECRA in November 2008, provided further information that the company sold non-Tesco brand products with GM ingredients, but that they were clearly labelled. It also stated that some own-brand products sold in other countries did contain GM products, but that these too were clearly labelled. (ref: 169)

GM possible in certain food products (2006)

According to the Greenpeace Shoppers Guide to Genetic Modification, viewed on the Greenpeace UK website on 7th September 2006, the following products had been given the ‘red’ rating applied to “food which may contain GM ingredients or be derived from animals fed on GM crops”: Tesco pork and Tesco milk and dairy products. (ref: 143)

Boycott Call

Boycott by CASPIAN for use of spychips (September 2009)

The Boycott Tesco website www.boycoottesco.com published by CASPIAN (Consumers Against Supermarket Privacy Invasion and Numbering) was viewed by ECRA in September 2009. The website stated that Tesco had been using RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) spychips in violation of an international call by privacy experts worldwide for a moratorium on item-level RFID tagging. Item level tagging involves placing an RFID tag on a product a consumer buys (as opposed to a tag on the outside of a crate or box of products in a warehouse). According to the website Tesco had announced plans to expand the trial from two to ten stores setting a precedent for other stores. The website called for a boycott of Tesco for the use of RFID technology. (ref: 183)

Boycott call over sale of live turtles (May 2008)

Care for the Wild International (CWI) had called for a boycott of Tesco over the sale of live turtles, tortoises and frogs in its Chinese stores. CWI had presented Tesco with evidence of animal welfare issues over the trade before calling for the boycott after Tesco refused to stop stocking the animals, according to the group’s website (www.careforthewild.com) viewed by ECRA May 2008. (ref: 184)

Political Activities

Political Donations in the UK (2007)

According to Tesco’s Annual Report and Financial Statements 2007 viewed on their corporate website (www.tescocorporate.com) on 6 February 2008:

“There were no political donations (2006 – £nil). During the year, the Group made contributions of £41,608 (2006 – £54,219) in the form of sponsorship for political events: Labour Party £11,000; Liberal Democrat Party £5,350; Conservative Party £4,218; Progressive Democrat Party £2,213; Fine Gael £1,476; Fianna Fail £1,408; the Republic of Ireland Labour Party £234; Trade Unions £15,709.” (ref: 186)

Membership of two free trade lobby groups (2006)

According to a 2006 report by the Seattle to Brussels Network, called ‘Corporate Power Over EU Trade Policy: Good for

business, bad for the world’, Tesco Metro was a member of the European Retail Round Table, which was similar in structure and its lobbying to the European Round Table of Industrialists. It also stated that Tesco was affiliated to Eurocommerce, which “aims, as a representative of a major economic sector, to ensure that trade and services in the European policy formation process are duly taken into account”. (ref: 187)

Anti-Social Finance

(See also ‘Child labour in cosmetics supply chain’ in **Workers’ Rights** above.)

Tax avoidance plan (February 2008)

According to an article published in The Guardian on 27th of February 2008, Tesco had created a structure involving offshore tax havens to avoid paying tax. The newspaper’s investigation had uncovered a string of Cayman Island companies used by Tesco, as the rate of corporation tax is zero in the islands. The stores were sold to external investors which apparently allowed Tesco to avoid tax on about £500m profit.

This investigation became the subject of a later Libel action by Tesco - which claims it only made £23m from the structure. (see e.g. Telegraph 08/04/2008).

According to a story which appeared on www.talkingretail.com on 17 September 2008, the Guardian ran a front page apology to Tesco, in which it agreed to pay the legal costs Tesco had forked out during the libel process. (ref: 188)

Poor conditions in South African supplier farms (February 2009)

The War on Want report ‘Sour Grapes: South African wine workers and British supermarket power’, published in February 2009, stated that the UK government’s Competition Commission report of April 2008 found that “supermarkets have used their buying power to squeeze suppliers by transferring risk and costs onto them”. Suppliers were reported to be hesitant to speak out against supermarkets in case they were removed from the supermarket’s list of suppliers.

Specific problems noted in relation to South African producers were the fact that it was rare for suppliers to have formal contracts, leading to the potential of being de-listed at short notice; supermarkets changing their costs and prices as they liked to suit their needs, and last minute order cancellations without compensation. South African producers were said not to receive assured prices, so there was no guarantee that they could cover their costs. Delays in payment for orders were said to be common, with 120-day long delays becoming increasingly so. Discounts offered by supermarkets were said to be often passed on to suppliers, through pressure to ‘promote’ the products. Supermarkets were also said to charge for good positioning on the shelf: from £15,000 to £100,000. In addition, it was stated that supermarkets often press suppliers to enter into exclusivity agreements with them, so that the suppliers were entirely dependent on one customer.

The report claimed that “it is the South African workers who pay the price for UK supermarket power and greed.” Issues related to this were said to be: sacking workers; lack of formal employment contracts and low wages. The trend towards employing seasonal workers who had no benefits was said to be increasing: in 1995 the ratio of seasonal workers to permanent workers was about equal; by 2000 it was 65%:35%. This was said to reduce the ability of the workers to organise. Women were said to be more vulnerable as a result of the worsening working conditions of workers, to be paid lower wages than men, and to be frequently subjected to sexual harassment at work.

Tesco was named as one of the largest importers of South African wine, with a 20% share of all sales. (ref: 63)

Trophy Cat Food

Owned by Trophy Pet Foods

Trophy Pet Foods is owned by Trophy International Animal Products (Oxford) Ltd

Trophy International Animal Products (Oxford) Ltd, 11-12 Market Place, Farringdon, Oxon, SN7 7HP, UK

Trophy International Animal Products (Oxford) Ltd also owns Trophy Dog Food

Environment

Environmental Reporting THIS ISN'T TO DATE BUT I DID CHECK THE POLICY – MIGHT HAVE UPDATED BUT NOT PROMOTED TO PRIMARY?

Worst ECRA rating for environmental policy (September 2008)

The Trophy Pet Foods website (www.trophypetfoods.co.uk), viewed by ECRA in September 2008, contained a document entitled 'The Trophy Green Policy' and an 'Official Environmental Policy Statement'. These documents mentioned that all the company's promotional material was printed on a combination of recycled and sustainably sourced paper. They mentioned recycling paper, cardboard, toner cartridges and computers and stated that they sourced 'as many of the ingredients for our pet foods in Britain as is possible. The documents also stated that the pet food was made in Wales, therefore limiting food miles. However, ECRA did not consider the documents to constitute a satisfactory environmental policy, as there were no dated, quantified future targets set, and no mention of independent verification was made. (ref: 189)

Animals

Factory farming

Sale of products containing meat not labelled as free range or organic (January 2010)

According to the Trophy Pet Foods website (www.trophypetfoods.co.uk), viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, the company sold pet food containing chicken, lamb and beef. While the website claimed that these meats were British, it did not state that they were labelled as free range or organic. (ref: 190)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of products containing meat not labelled as free range or organic' in Factory farming above.)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Trophy Pet Foods website, www.trophypetfoods.co.uk, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 190)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

GM policy (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer searched the Trophy Pet Food website, www.trophypetfoods.co.uk, in January 2010 for the company's GM policy and found the following statement: 'Our Super Premium Range contains GM free ingredients' This statement only applied to part of the company's range. As the company sold pet food containing both grain and meat it was likely that, in the absence of a company wide policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products

from animals fed GM crops. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 190)

V-Dog Dog Food [A]

Owned by Judges Choice Pet Food Ltd

Judges Choice Pet Food Ltd, Foulger Warehousing, Roudham Road, Harling Road, Norwich, NR16 2QN

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environment report (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the Judges Choice website, www.judgeschoice.com, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 191)

Animals

Animal Testing

Worst rating for animal testing (January 2010)

According to a cached page of the Judges Choice website, www.judgeschoice.com, one of its pet food products had been developed without the use of animal testing. This implied that other pet food products its sold had been developed with the use of animal testing. The company also sold pet shampoos and conditioners, which in the absence of an animal testing policy were likely to contain ingredients which had been tested on animals. Judges Choice therefore received Ethical Consumers worst rating for animal testing. (ref: 191)

Factory farming

Sale of non-free range meat (January 2010)

Judges Choice's range of pet foods, viewed on its website, www.judgeschoice.com, by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, included meat based offerings which did not appear to use organic or free range meat. (ref: 191)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Sale of non-free range meat' in Factory farming above.)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Judges Choice website, www.judgeschoice.com, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 191)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No policy on GM on company website (January 2010)

There was no GM policy apparent on the Judges Choice website, www.judgeschoice.com, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. As the company sold pet food containing both grain and meat it was likely that, in the absence of such a policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil

Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent

invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 191)

Product sustainability

Animal Welfare Features

Vegetarian Society Approved (February 2005)

According to the Judges Choice website, www.judgeschoice.com, viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010, V-Dog dog food was approved by the Vegetarian Society. (ref: 191)

Vitalin Cat Food

Owned by Kennel Nutrition Ltd

Kennel Nutrition Ltd, Dallamires Lane, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG4 1TT

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environment report (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the Vitalin website, www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 192)

Animals

Factory farming

Contains meat not labelled as free range or organic (January 2010)

It was apparent from the Vitalin website, www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 that the company sold meat products and that these were not advertised as being from organic or free range sources. (ref: 192)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Contains meat not labelled as free range or organic' in Factory farming above.)

Encouraging pet breeding (January 2010)

Ethical Consumer found the following on the Vitalin website, www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk, in January 2010: 'Join our Breeder Club today and receive the following benefits: 'Puppy/Kitten Packs sent out to give each new puppy/kitten owner. Free bag of your normal Vitalin Complete Dog Food/Cat Food with every 10 puppies/kittens sold.' Given that many cats and dogs are put down every week due to a lack of available homes and animal rescue centres struggle with the sheer numbers of unwanted animals it was considered irresponsible of Vitalin to be encouraging pet breeding in this way. (ref: 192)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Vitalin website, www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 192)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No company-wide policy on GM on company website (January 2010)

Although some of the products on the Vitalin website, www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk, were marketed as GM-free, not all were so it was assumed that there was no guarantee that these other products did not contain GM ingredients. In addition, as the meat used in the products, and there was nothing to state otherwise, it was likely that the company was selling animal products sourced from animals fed on GM animal feed. A Soil Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 192)

Wackidog dog food [A]

Owned by Triangle Wholefoods Collective Ltd

Triangle Wholefoods Collective Ltd, Lacey Way, Lowfields Industrial Park, Elland, West Yorks, HX5 9DB, UK

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Middle ECRA rating for environmental reporting (October 2009)

Suma responded to a request by Ethical Consumer on its environmental reporting in October 2009 with a copy of its most recent CSR document. The document related to the financial year ending September 30th 2009 and included some reporting on past performance (energy use - electricity, diesel, gas) for the years 2006-2008. Although only three pages long the document showed that the company had a good understanding of its environmental impacts and took reducing them to a minimum seriously. The document contained two quantified future targets: to reduce the CO2 intensity of its operations a further 6% in the coming year with additional incremental savings thereafter and to improve energy efficiency by an aggregate 20% by 2012 against its baseline of 2004-05. The report was not independently verified and therefore received Ethical Consumer's middle rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 193)

People

Human Rights

Positive sourcing policy on human rights (January 2010)

Suma's Ethical Policy was found on the company website, www.suma.coop, when searched by Ethical Consumer on 7th January 2010. It stated that the company aimed to avoid buying from countries or companies with proven poor human rights records. (ref: 194)

Supply Chain Policy

Worst ECRA rating for supply chain policy (January 2010)

Suma's Ethical Policy was found on the company website, www.suma.coop, when searched by Ethical Consumer on 7th January 2010. It stated that Suma's buying policy was as follows:

'To source goods at the best possible quality and price within acceptable ethical parameters. Goods must fulfil Suma's criteria, namely:- We aim to promote 'green' and healthy eating. We will not knowingly stock products which contain harmful food additives; all our products are carefully sourced as Vegetarian. Where eggs are an ingredient they are free-range; preferences are given to organic, fair trade and cooperative production; independent manufacturers are preferred; bodycare, cosmetic and household products are all cruelty-free; sourced as locally as practicable to limit food miles; sourced with minimal environmental impact in terms of production, transportation and packaging; GM free; we aim to promote a market for new and innovative green products; we aim to avoid buying from countries or companies with proven

poor human rights records; Suma respects boycotts as appropriate when organised by nationally recognised bodies.

In its questionnaire response dated October 2009 it also stated that 'as an organisation managed and owned by its workers Suma does not have a top down approach regarding policies and procedures. The workers at Suma will not stand for the business to deal with any unethical organisations as a customer, supplier or service provider – we argue endlessly about the ethics of who we work with and do not deal with those the coop members believe to be unethical.'

Whilst all aspects of Suma's buying policy were considered positive and meaningful, the company did not have anything in place to guarantee the protection of workers' rights throughout its supply chain. Suma therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for supply chain policy. (ref: 194)

Politics

Company Ethos

Company ethos (January 2009)

According to a questionnaire filled in by Suma for Ethical Consumer in October 2009, 'Suma wholefoods is a workers Cooperative – managed and owned by its workers. Only its workers can hold a share of the business, we cannot be bought or sold and so will always remain independent.' (ref: 195)

Best ECRA rating for animal testing policy (October 2009)

According to a questionnaire filled in by Suma for Ethical Consumer in October 2009, Suma (as a Brand) carried the Humane Cosmetics Standard and its ecoleaf Branded cleaning range carried the Household Product standard. It also stated that as a wholesaler Suma did not stock any products which were animal tested. (ref: 195)

Product sustainability

Animal Welfare Features

Suitable for vegans (October 2009)

According to a questionnaire filled in by Suma for Ethical Consumer in October 2009 Suma Wackidog was vegan. (ref: 195)

Wagg Dog Food

Owned by Wagg Foods

Wagg Foods, Dalton Airfield, Topcliffe, Thirsk, YO7 3HE

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Worst ECRA rating for environmental reporting (January 2010)

There was no environmental report or policy apparent on the Wagg Foods website, www.waggfoods.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The company therefore received Ethical Consumer's worst rating for environmental reporting. (ref: 196)

Animals

Animal Testing

No animal testing policy (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Wagg Foods website, www.waggfoods.co.uk, for the company's animal testing policy. No such policy could be found. Wagg was not endorsed on either the Uncaged or PETA website as a company that did not test its pet foods on animals. (ref: 196)

Factory farming

Company sells meat not labelled as free range or organic

(January 2010)

The Wagg Foods website, www.waggfoods.co.uk, was viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. The company sold meat based pet foods which were not labelled as being free range or organic. There was no animal welfare policy apparent on the company's website. (ref: 196)

Animal Rights

(See also 'Company sells meat not labelled as free range or organic' in Factory farming above.)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website

(January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Wagg Foods website, www.waggfoods.co.uk, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 196)

Politics

Genetic Engineering

No policy on GM on company website (January 2010)

There was no GM policy apparent on the Wagg Foods website, www.waggfoods.co.uk, when viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. As the company sold pet food containing both grain and meat it was likely that, in the absence of such a policy, the company was selling products containing both genetically modified grains and animal products from animals fed GM crops. A Soil

Association report published in November 2008, entitled 'Silent invasion: the hidden use of GM crops in livestock feed', estimated that around 60% of the maize and 30% of the soya in the feed used by dairy and pig farmers is GM. Therefore without a policy to the contrary we would assume there is a high probability that such products would be derived from animal fed GM feed. (ref: 196)

Yarrah Organic & Vegetarian Dog Food [A,O]

Owned by Roelevink Beheer BV

Roelevink Beheer BV, PO Box 448, 3840, AK Harderwijk, Netherlands

Environment

Environmental Reporting

Best ECRA rating for environmental reporting (January 2010)

Yarrah's website (www.yarrah.com) did not contain an environmental policy when it was viewed by Ethical Consumer in January 2010. Ethical Consumer awarded its best mark for environmental reporting as the company was a small company (its turnover was confirmed as under £5 million by the Hoovers factsheet of its parent company) offering environmental alternatives, as the company only made organic pet food, which had a lower environmental impact than conventional pet food. (ref: 197)

Animals

Animal Rights

Sale and processing of organic poultry (January 2010)

Yarrah's website (www.yarrah.com) stated that the company processed organic chicken when it was viewed by ECRA in January 2010. (ref: 197)

People

Supply Chain Policy

No supply chain policy apparent on company website (January 2010)

A search was made by Ethical Consumer in January 2010 of the Yarra website, www.yarra.com, for the company's supply chain policy to protect workers rights in its supply chain. No such information could be found. (ref: 197)

Politics

Company Ethos

(See also 'Best ECRA rating for environmental reporting' in Environmental Reporting above.)

Product sustainability

Organic product

Organic certification (January 2010)

According to the Yarra website, www.yarra.com, viewed by Ethical Consumer on 11th January 2010, all of its products were certified as organic by Skal/EKO. (ref: 197)

Animal Welfare Features

Vegetarian and Vegan Society Approved Products (January 2010)

According to the Yarra website, www.yarra.com, viewed by Ethical Consumer on 11th January 2010, its vegetarian/vegan dog food was approved by both the Vegetarian and Vegan Society. (ref: 197)

Ami Dog Food [A]

See Vegco above

Arden Grange Dog Food

See Leander International Pet Foods Ltd. above

Asda Dog Food

See Asda Group Ltd above

Benevo Cat Food

See Vegco above

Benevo Dog Food

See Vegco above

Burns Dog Food

See Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd above

Burns Meat Free Dog Food

See Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd above

Burns Organic Dog Food [O]

See Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd above

Chappie Dog Food

See Mars Petcare UK Ltd above

Classic cat food

See Butcher's Petcare Ltd above

Co-op Dog Food

See Co-operative Group Ltd above

Eukanuba Dog Food

See Procter & Gamble Company above

Felix cat food

See Nestlé Purina Petcare above

Go-Cat Cat Food

See Nestlé Purina Petcare above

Hill's Science Plan Dog Food

See Hill's Pet Nutrition above

Iams Dog Food

See Procter & Gamble Company above

Kitekat Cat Food

See Mars Petcare UK Ltd above

Morrisons Dog Food

See Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc above

Morrisons Organic Cat Food [O]

See Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc above

OrganiPets Complete Organic Dog Food [O]

See OrganiPets Limited above

Pedigree dog food

See Mars Petcare UK Ltd above

Pero Organic Cat Food [O]

See Pero (Foods Ltd) above

Pero Organic Dog Food [O]

See Pero (Foods Ltd) above

Sainsbury's Dog Food

See J Sainsbury plc above

Sainsbury's So Organic Cat Food

See J Sainsbury plc above

Sheba Cat Food

See Mars Petcare UK Ltd above

Tesco Dog Food

See Tesco plc above

Trophy Dog Food

See Trophy Pet Foods above

Vitalin Dog Food

See Kennel Nutrition Ltd above

Wafcol Dog Food

See Armitage Pet Care above

Wafcol Vegetarian Dog Food [A]

See Armitage Pet Care above

Whiskas Cat Food

See Mars Petcare UK Ltd above

Whiskas Organic Cat Food [O]

See Mars Petcare UK Ltd above

Winalot Dog Food

See Nestlé Purina Petcare above

Yarrah Organic Cat Food [O]

See Roelevink Beheer BV above

Yarrah Organic Dog Food [O]

See Roelevink Beheer BV above

References

- 1 - Vegeco Corporate Communications:www.vegeco.net (12 January 2010) (538888)
- 2 - Leander International Pet Foods Ltd. Corporate Communications:www.ardengrange.com (14 January 2010) (539020)
- 3 - Nestlé SA Corporate Communications:Creating Shared Values (December 2008) (532694)
- 4 - ClimateChangeCorp.com:Palm oil illegally farmed (10 July 2007) (506176)
- 5 - Guardian, The:Big food companies accused of risking climate catastrophe (8 November 2007) (516524)
- 6 - ENDS Report:386 (March 2007) (312244)
- 7 - Business & Human Rights Resource Centre:China: Subsidiaries of multinationals including Panasonic, PepsiCo, Nestlé on "blacklist" of polluti (300976)
- 8 - CSR Asia Weekly:Vol 2 week 44 (1st November 2006) (1 November 2006) (301285)
- 9 - ENDS Report:369 (October 2005) (October 2005) (277674)
- 10 - Uncaged website www.uncaged.co.uk:Petfood (6 January 2010) (538635)
- 11 - Nestlé SA Corporate Communications:www.nestle.com (8 January 2010) (538685)
- 12 - Alcon Laboratories, Inc. Corporate Communications:www.

- alcon.com (14 August 2009) (535740)
- 13 - Earth Island Journal:Summer 2007, Vol. 22 No.2 (July 2007) (505833)
- 14 - www.abitothome.ca:1 December 2005 (277764)
- 15 - Food Magazine:Issue 84 (March 2009) (534717)
- 16 - Cacharel Corporate Communications:www.cacharel.com (31 August 2005) (269157)
- 17 - Amnesty International Website:Trade unionists under attack in Colombia (October 2007) (535749)
- 18 - Business & Human Rights Resource Centre:Permanent Peoples' Tribunal, Colombia, July 2008 (24 July 2008) (538889)
- 19 - www.columbiasolidarity.org.uk:24 August 2009 (537917)
- 20 - Food Magazine:July/September 2007 (25 April 2008) (522282)
- 21 - Hazards:100 (October 2007) (521801)
- 22 - Nestlé SA Corporate Communications:Nestle 2009 Supplier Code (July 2009) (538048)
- 23 - Baby Milk Action www.babymilkaction.org:Boycott list (8 January 2010) (538690)
- 24 - Ecologist, The:April 2006 (292633)
- 25 - Baby Milk Action Update:38, September 2006 (14 May 2008) (523087)
- 26 - Nestlé SA Corporate Communications:www.nestle.com (27 September 2009) (537056)
- 27 - Baby Milk Action www.babymilkaction.org:October 2005 (539313)
- 28 - Corpwatch.org:WHO shuts Life Sciences Industry Group out of setting health standards (2 February 2006) (513086)
- 29 - Baby Milk Action Update:37 (December 2005) (December 2005) (283791)
- 30 - USCIB Members List www.uscib.org:www.uscib.org (20 July 2007) (506784)
- 31 - Nestlé SA Corporate Communications:Annual Report 2008 (2008) (533239)
- 32 - www.swissinfo.ch:Pension funds insist on executive pay vote (23 September 2008) (539321)
- 33 - ASDA Group Ltd Corporate Communications www.about-asda.co.uk:www.about-asda.com (8 July 2009) (534625)
- 34 - Ethical Performance:Volume 8 Issue 6 (November 2006) (303405)
- 35 - Wal-Mart Stores Inc Corporate Communications:www.walmartstores.com (8 July 2009) (534618)
- 36 - Wal-Mart Stores Inc Corporate Communications:www.walmartstores.com (3 November 2008) (528818)
- 37 - Asda Group Ltd Corporate Communications:ASDA website (2 May 2007) (311634)
- 38 - www.socialfunds.com:Shareholder action on product toxicity shifts from isolated resolutions to become a campaign (20 Feb 2008) (284544)
- 39 - CSR Asia Weekly:Vol 2 week 24 (14 June 2006) (298527)
- 40 - Slaughtering the Amazon, Greenpeace International:June 2009 (534702)
- 41 - Asda Group Ltd Corporate Communications:www.asda.co.uk/corp/customer_service/FAQs.htm (7 November 2008) (528988)
- 42 - Wal-Mart Stores Inc Corporate Communications:Wal-Mart Statements www.walmartstores.com/wmstore/wmstores/Mainnews.jsp?BV_SessionID=@@ @ @0533 (25 Au (268397)
- 43 - BUAV Campaign Report:Summer 2005 (July 2005) (270595)
- 44 - Asda Group Ltd Corporate Communications:ECRA company questionnaire (October 2008) (529097)
- 45 - Asda Group Ltd Corporate Communications:www.asda.co.uk (11 November 2008) (529104)
- 46 - Amnesty International:Conflict Diamonds (23 January 2009) (530713)
- 47 - Green Futures:Number 60 September/October 2006 (21 May 2008) (523743)
- 48 - Down to Earth:No 71 (1 November 2006) (306187)
- 49 - Reuters www.reuters.com:Wal-Mart avoids charged in post-Thanksgiving death (6 May 2009) (535866)
- 50 - National Labor Committee (www.nlcnet.org):Wal Mart dumped from one of the world's largest pension funds (20 March 2007) (507898)

- 51 - National Labor Committee:Disney's Children's Books Made with blood,sweat and tears (18 August 2005) (514198)
- 52 - Labour Behind the Label:Let's Clean Up Fashion report (September 2006) (299324)
- 53 - Ethical Trading Initiative website www.ethicaltrade.org:ETI website list of members (14 November 2008) (529206)
- 54 - Baby Milk Action:Baby Feeding Law Group (28 September 2006) (298548)
- 55 - Sky News (www.sky.com):Monday 28th April (8 May 2008) (522764)
- 56 - Wal-Mart Stores Inc Corporate Communications:www.walmart.com/catalog (19 May 2006) (291267)
- 57 - Asda Group Ltd Corporate Communications:EC Questionnaire response (19 January 2009) (530728)
- 58 - Feeling Blue Seeing Red:www.feelingblueseeingred.org (22 July 2009) (535323)
- 59 - War on Want communications and reports:ASDA Wal-Mart: the alternative report (September 2005) (536501)
- 60 - Ecologist, The:March 2006 (291501)
- 61 - Occupational Hazards:Inspector General's Report Critical of Way Labor Dept Handled Wal-Mart Deal (1 November 2005) (276555)
- 62 - Guardian, The:Fired Wal-Mart executive turns spotlight on bosses' conduct (28 May 2007) (502770)
- 63 - War on Want communications and reports:Sour Grapes: South African wine workers and British supermarket power (February 2009) (538293)
- 64 - Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd Corporate Communications:www.burnspet.co.uk (13 January 2010) (538926)
- 65 - Burns Pet Nutrition Ltd Corporate Communications: Questionnaire response (15 January 2010) (539212)
- 66 - FW Baker Ltd Corporate Communications:Ethical Policy (14 January 2010) (539187)
- 67 - FW Baker Ltd Corporate Communications:www.butcherspetcare.com (14 January 2010) (539186)
- 68 - Mars UK Ltd Corporate Communications:Mars company questionnaire (13 November 2009) (538432)
- 69 - ENDS Report:383 (December 2006) (December 2006) (303375)
- 70 - Mars Inc Corporate Communications:www.mars.com (20 June 2008) (524958)
- 71 - Mars UK Ltd Corporate Communications:Questionnaire completed by company (27 August 2009) (536158)
- 72 - Food Magazine:April/June 2007 (June 2007) (507431)
- 73 - USA Today:Age discrimination flourishes in Mexico (24 September 2007) (537236)
- 74 - Food Magazine:Issue 70 (July/Sept 2005) (July 2005) (302093)
- 75 - Mars Inc Corporate Communications:GMO Policy (October 2007) (535409)
- 76 - PETA websites www.peta.org www.stopanimaltests.com www.iamscruelty.com www.askcarla.com:www.marscandykills.com (6 January 2010) (538638)
- 77 - Ecologist, The:December/January 2008 (11 April 2008) (521978)
- 78 - National Foreign Trade Council www.nftc.org:www.nftc.org (25 May 2007) (502550)
- 79 - International Chamber of Commerce ICC www.iccwbo.org: www.iccwbo.org (16 May 2007) (312527)
- 80 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications: Sustainability Report 2008/09 (24 November 2009) (538244)
- 81 - WWF:Palm oil score card (26 November 2009) (538369)
- 82 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications:ECRA company questionnaire response (30 October 2008) (528983)
- 83 - Marine Conservation Society fish online:Sustainable Seafood Supermarket League table (March 2007) (311963)
- 84 - Supermarkets & Farm Animal Welfare 'Raising the Standard':Supermarket Survey 2005-2006 (16 June 2006) (292513)
- 85 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications:www.co-operative.coop (24 November 2008) (529548)
- 86 - Shop Survey:Shop Survey (24 April 2007) (311242)
- 87 - Guardian Unlimited / Guardian website www.guardian.co.uk:Bribery and corruption top Co-op's 'sin list' (28 June 2005) (260896)
- 88 - Workplacelaw.net:Co-op fined £40,000 after management failings led to lax health and safety culture (31 August 2006) (296348)
- 89 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications:Sound Sourcing Code of Conduct (6 September 2009) (536263)
- 90 - Ethical Trading Initiative website www.ethicaltrade.org: Members of the Ethical Trading Initiative (17 August 2005) (17 August 2005) (266785)
- 91 - Mintel Market Intelligence:Mintel December 2007 Convenience Retailing Report (8 May 2008) (522726)
- 92 - BBC News Website www.bbc.co.uk:Cancer chemical 'in soft drinks' (31 March 2006) (292323)
- 93 - BBC News Website www.bbc.co.uk:Unhealthy store offers criticised <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/uk/4468688.stm> (25 November 2007) (277390)
- 94 - Co-operative Insurance Society (CIS) Corporate Communications:www.cis.co.uk (5 September 2007) (512034)
- 95 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications:2006 Sustainability Report (15 January 2008) (519561)
- 96 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications: Questionnaire (4 September 2009) (536260)
- 97 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications: Sustainability Report 07/08 (3 November 2008) (528821)
- 98 - BBC News Website www.bbc.co.uk:Retailers in tobacco price probe (25 April 2008) (522295)
- 99 - Co-operative Group Ltd Corporate Communications:Co-operative Group website www.co-op.co.uk (27 April 2005) (255872)
- 100 - Procter & Gamble Company Corporate Communications: Sustainability Report 2009 (2009) (538717)
- 101 - www.peri.umass.edu:Toxic 100 Index (30 April 2008) (522423)
- 102 - Campaign for Safe Cosmetics:A Poison Kiss: the Problem of Lead in Lipstick (October 2007) (515216)
- 103 - www.skinceuticals.com:8 June 2007 (503205)
- 104 - Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil:www.rspo.org (8 July 2007) (506030)
- 105 - The Iams Company Corporate Communications:The Iams Company Animal Study Policy (17 February 2006) (284459)
- 106 - Uncaged website www.uncaged.co.uk:www.uncaged.co.uk (8 January 2010) (538689)
- 107 - Procter & Gamble Company Corporate Communications: www.iamscruelty.com (15 January 2010) (539227)
- 108 - Animal Times:Summer 2005 (June 2005) (283039)
- 109 - Procter & Gamble Company Corporate Communications: www.pg.com (8 January 2010) (538774)
- 110 - CSR Asia Weekly:Vol 2 week 12 (22 March 2006) (289460)
- 111 - www.chinalaborwatch.org: Procter & Gamble Factory Investigation (January 2005) (301444)
- 112 - Procter & Gamble Company Corporate Communications: Sustainability Guidelines for Suppliers (2009) (538748)
- 113 - BBC News Website www.bbc.co.uk:Procter & Gamble recalls 120,000 Vicks nasal sprays (20 November 2009) (538096)
- 114 - Multinational Monitor:March/April 2007 (12 February 2008) (520818)
- 115 - forbes.com:China finds banned substances in P&G cosmetics from Japan - reports (18 September 2006) (538780)
- 116 - Uncaged website www.uncaged.co.uk:www.uncaged.co.uk (21 February 2007) (308718)
- 117 - World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) www.wbcsd.org:Member list (17 July 2009) (535184)
- 118 - National Foreign Trade Council www.nftc.org:www.nftc.org (12 August 2009) (535646)
- 119 - CSR Asia Weekly:Vol 2 week 39 (27 September 2006) (298465)
- 120 - Multinational Monitor:Vol 26 no 7&8 (July-August 2005) (July 2005) (276040)
- 121 - Armitage Pet Care Corporate Communications:www.armitages.co.uk (13 January 2010) (538976)

- 122 - Colgate-Palmolive Co Corporate Communications:www.colgate.com (11 January 2010) (538787)
- 123 - ECRA shop survey:1 November 2007 (515221)
- 124 - PETA - Companies that test on animals:Companies that do test on animals (11 January 2007) (306007)
- 125 - Hill's Pet Nutrition Corporate Communications:www.hillspet.com (5 November 2007) (515349)
- 126 - Colgate-Palmolive Co Corporate Communications:Annual Report (2008) (538797)
- 127 - Hill's Pet Nutrition Corporate Communications:www.hillspet.com (11 January 2010) (538793)
- 128 - Naturewatch Compassionate Shopping Guide:11th Edition (2008) (520872)
- 129 - SustainAbility:Influencing Power: Reviewing the conduct and content of corporate lobbying (2005) (504196)
- 130 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Corporate Communications:Morrison's 2009 CSR Report (23 June 2009) (534196)
- 131 - National Consumer Council:Greening the supermarkets (November 2006) (312087)
- 132 - Independent, The:Some are short, some are long, but critics say FTSE 100 CSR reviews are nothing more than corporate (299692)
- 133 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Corporate Communications:www.morrison's.co.uk (19 January 2010) (539292)
- 134 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Corporate Communications:Morrison's CSR Report 2008 (29 October 2008) (528730)
- 135 - Greenpeace lighb bulb retailers survey:Power Crazy: League Table of Light Bulb retailers (27 August 2007) (510426)
- 136 - Guardian Unlimited / Guardian website www.guardian.co.uk:British supermarkets accused over destruction of Amazon rainforest (31 May 2009) (534059)
- 137 - Ethical Consumer: 97 Nov/Dec 2005 (November 2005) (266089)
- 138 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Corporate Communications:www.morrison's.co.uk (29 October 2008) (528711)
- 139 - Guardian Unlimited / Guardian website www.guardian.co.uk:Misery at bottom of supermarket supply chain (15 August 2007) (517677)
- 140 - GMB Union website:Morrison Women Facing Sack on Christmas Eve are Victims of Sex Discrimination Says GMB (8 November 2) (276855)
- 141 - Ethical Performance:Volume 9 Issue 8 (3 June 2008) (524188)
- 142 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Corporate Communications:www.morrison's.co.uk (27 June 2008) (525263)
- 143 - Greenpeace GM Campaign webpage:Shoppers Guide to GM (September 2006) (312884)
- 144 - Big Campaign Website (Boycott Israeli Goods) www.bigcampaign.org:Detailed boycott list www.bigcampaign.org/boycottlistwot2.html (23 February 2005) (250355)
- 145 - NatureDiet Pet Foods Corporate Communications:www.naturediet.co.uk (14 January 2010) (539053)
- 146 - OrganiPets Limited Corporate Communications: Questionnaire response (15 October 2009) (538654)
- 147 - Pero (Foods Ltd) Corporate Communications:www.pero-petfood.co.uk (13 January 2010) (538957)
- 148 - J Sainsbury plc Corporate Communications:Corporate Responsibility Report 2009 (22 January 2010) (539474)
- 149 - J Sainsbury plc Corporate Communications:J Sainsbury plc Corporate Responsibility Report 2008 (12 November 2008) (529118)
- 150 - J Sainsbury plc Corporate Communications:ECRA company questionnaire (7 November 2008) (528960)
- 151 - Food Magazine:Issue 72 (January 2006) (292741)
- 152 - J Sainsbury plc Corporate Communications:www.j-sainsbury.co.uk (12 November 2008) (529111)
- 153 - War on Want communications and reports:Profiting from the Occupation: corporate complicity in Israel's crimes against the Palestinian people (295174)
- 154 - Independent, The:Sainsbury's denies double standards in "bag for life" row (1 May 2007) (507031)
- 155 - Hazards:93 (January-March 2006) (January 2006) (285524)
- 156 - The Ecumenical Council for Corporate Responsibility: Vulnerable Migrant Workers: The Responsibility of Business (May 2009) (534180)
- 157 - Labour Research:Vol 95 no 8 (August 2006) (295340)
- 158 - J Sainsbury plc Corporate Communications:www.j-sainsbury.com (22 January 2010) (539476)
- 159 - Labour Behind the Label:Let's Clean Up Fashion - 2009 update (2009) (538387)
- 160 - J Sainsbury plc Corporate Communications:http://www.sainsburys.co.uk/food/foodandfeatures/suppliers/fairtrade/fairtrade.htm (23 January 2009) (530772)
- 161 - www.fpb.org.uk:FPB Hall of Shame June 2006 (15 June 2006) (292641)
- 162 - Tesco Corporate Communications:Corporate Responsibility Rpt 2009 (8 July 2009) (534585)
- 163 - CSR Network Press Release:CSR Reporting - Examining the Unpalatable Issues (18 April 2005) (257075)
- 164 - Tesco Corporate Communications:www.tesco.com (10 July 2009) (534740)
- 165 - ENDS Report:October 2008 (October 2008) (536180)
- 166 - Ecologist, The:May 2007 (506192)
- 167 - Tesco plc Corporate Communications:Tesco shopping website direct.tesco.com (27 July 2007) (507255)
- 168 - CSR Asia Weekly:Vol.2 Week 25 (June 2006) (522711)
- 169 - Tesco plc Corporate Communications:ECRA Company Questionnaire (31 October 2008) (529002)
- 170 - BBC News Website www.bbc.co.uk:Tesco 'breaching planning laws' (18 August 2006) (295650)
- 171 - Tesco plc Corporate Communications:Corporate Responsibility Review (2008) (523210)
- 172 - Dobbies Garden Centres Ltd Corporate Communications: Dobbies questionnaire response (14 May 2008) (523177)
- 173 - Ethical Consumer:87 (1 February 2004) (213928)
- 174 - Hillside Animal Sanctuary:Winter 2007/8 (12 June 2008) (524406)
- 175 - Tesco plc Corporate Communications:www.tescocorporate.com (10 November 2008) (529008)
- 176 - Farm Animal Voice:Winter 2007 (1 May 2008) (522523)
- 177 - Advocates for Animals:April 2005 (28 April 2005) (255928)
- 178 - www.tortoisetrust.org:Tesco to continue abusing animals in China (10 June 2006) (304929)
- 179 - Clean Clothes Campaign reports:Cashing in: Giant Retailers, Purchasing Practices, and Working Conditions in the Garment Industry (F (535794)
- 180 - Times Newspaper/Times Online www.timesonline.co.uk: Child labour used in cosmetics industry (19 July 2009) (535847)
- 181 - War on Want website www.waronwant.org:www.waronwant.org (26 June 2008) (529345)
- 182 - Mail Online:Bullets, bread and beer, tambourines and toothpaste... and the 180 other things you can do with a (537249)
- 183 - Boycott Tesco www.boycotttesco.com:Boycott Tesco for using RFID spy chips www.boycotttesco.com (9 September 2009) (536499)
- 184 - www.careforthewild.com:23 May 2008 (523924)
- 185 - Big Campaign Website (Boycott Israeli Goods) www.bigcampaign.org:www.bigcampaign.org (13 May 2008) (523000)
- 186 - Tesco plc Corporate Communications:Annual Report & Financial Statements 2007 (6 February 2008) (520715)
- 187 - Corporate Power over EU Trade Policy: Good for business, bad for the world:26 January 2007 (307456)
- 188 - Guardian, The:Tesco's £1bn tax avoiding plan (27 February 2008) (521822)
- 189 - Trophy International Animal Products (Oxford) Ltd Corporate Communications:www.trophypetfoods.co.uk (10 September 2008) (527885)
- 190 - Trophy International Animal Products (Oxford) Ltd Corporate Communications:www.trophypetfoods.co.uk (14 January 2010) (539072)
- 191 - Judges Choice Pet Food Ltd Corporate Communications: www.judgeschoice.com (11 January 2010) (538823)

- 192 - Kennel Nutrition Ltd Corporate Communications:www.vitalinpetfood.co.uk (12 January 2010) (538856)
- 193 - Triangle Wholefoods Collective Ltd Corporate Communications:CSR Report (15 October 2009) (538644)
- 194 - Triangle Wholefoods Collective Ltd Corporate Communications:www.suma.coop (7 January 2010) (538647)
- 195 - Triangle Wholefoods Collective Ltd Corporate Communications:Ethical Consumer questionnaire response (15 October 2009) (538642)
- 196 - Wagg Foods Corporate Communications:www.waggfoods.co.uk (13 January 2010) (538912)
- 197 - Roelevink Beheer BV Corporate Communications:www.yarrah.com (11 January 2010) (538816)