

# The Annual Code Report 2009

**THE PORTMAN GROUP'S CODE OF PRACTICE**  
ON THE NAMING, PACKAGING AND PROMOTION OF ALCOHOLIC DRINKS

# Contents

---

Portman Group	1
Foreword by the Portman Group Chief Executive	2
Report of the Chairman of the Independent Complaints Panel	3
Products:	
Speedball	4
Baby Blue & Baby Pink	5
Rampant TT's	6
Green King Beer Promotion	7
Mmwah!	8
Toyko*	10
Cornish Rattler Cyder	11
Retailer Alert Bulletins	12
How to make a complaint under the Code	13
The Independent Complaints Panel	14
The Portman Group's Code Advisory Service	16
Code Signatories	17

# Portman Group

The **Portman Group** was established in 1989 by the leading UK drinks producers. Its purpose is to encourage and champion the alcohol industry's commitment to social responsibility through its Code of Practice on the Naming, Packaging and Promotion of Alcoholic Drinks. It also represents its member companies' views on alcohol-related social issues.

Its full members are:

**AB InBev UK; Bacardi Brown-Forman Brands UK; Beverage Brands UK; Carlsberg UK; Molson Coors Brewing Company UK; Diageo GB; Heineken UK; Pernod Ricard UK.**

## Foreword by the Portman Group Chief Executive, David Poley



The pressure was turned up on the alcohol industry over its marketing activities during 2009. This was led by campaigner, Professor Gerard Hastings, whose critical report, "Under the Influence", was published by the British Medical Association in September. In January 2010, the Health Select Committee unsurprisingly added to this pressure by calling for tighter controls on alcohol marketing. I say "unsurprisingly"; the Committee is advised by Professor Hastings.

This increased pressure is despite the fact that the weight of evidence suggests that, in a mature market, the predominant effect of responsible marketing will be to encourage brand switching, not harmful consumption. Government and regulators must maintain an evidence-based approach and resist the clamour for a symbolic clampdown. We would, of course, carefully consider any new evidence that suggests a negative association. Just because a product is misused by some people, however, does not necessarily mean that its marketing is problematic.

Very often critics of industry regulation are unable to cite examples of where the regulatory system is possibly failing. They also overlook the fact that our Code is admired the world over and there's a demonstrably independent complaints process. Rather than dismissing the system out of hand, campaigners should report any specific concerns to Sir Richard Tilt and his Panel. We want to work with them to eliminate irresponsible marketing.

Our strategy is to continue to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Codes while remaining responsive to new evidence and emerging marketing practices. One of our projects throughout the year was to meet the regulatory challenges posed by new media. In September, we published the 'Responsible Marketing of Alcoholic Drinks in Digital Media.' This gives comprehensive advice to companies on how to stay within the Portman Group and the UK Advertising Codes in this increasingly popular area of marketing. It is a fast moving area with every invention presenting new

opportunities and fresh dilemmas for marketers. We expect our advice to be applied to all existing and emerging digital marketing. We will also regularly review the guidance to keep it relevant and socially responsible.

Throughout the year, we saw a steep rise in the number of drinks companies seeking confidential pre-sale marketing advice from the Portman Group. This service aims to head-off possibly problematic marketing strategies before they go live. Our Code Advisory Service dealt with 356 requests for help from marketers last year, forty percent more than the total for the previous year. This suggests that alcohol companies are acutely aware of the importance of social responsibility. This positive trend also meant the number of complaints remained low throughout the year.

In August, we welcomed a new Chairman of the Portman Group, Seymour Fortescue. In a break with tradition, Seymour does not represent any drinks company. He will provide independent leadership to the industry, having held several senior positions in marketing, regulation and health promotion. I anticipate that his knowledge and experience will be a tremendous asset as we continue to strengthen industry standards.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to Sir Richard Tilt, his colleagues on the Panel and my staff for their hard work during the year. I dare say that there will be no let up in the focus on alcohol marketing in 2010 but with the continuation of all their good work one can be sure that the rare examples of irresponsible practice will be dealt with swiftly and firmly.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "DPoley". The signature is stylized and written in a cursive-like font.

**David Poley**  
**Chief Executive, Portman Group**  
March 2010

# Report of the Chairman of the Independent Complaints Panel, Sir Richard Tilt



This has been my third year as Chairman of the Independent Complaints Panel. Two members, Angela Sarkis and Callum Jacobs, retired from the Panel having completed their six year tenure and I am very grateful to them for their contribution over this period. I am delighted to welcome three new members: Stephen Robinson, Director of Student Services at De Montfort University; Laura Hyrapetian, 5th year medical student at Brighton and Sussex Medical School; and Fiona Lewis, sociology teacher at Woodhouse College.

As David Poley indicates in his foreword, this year has been characterised by a good deal of attention focussed on the alcohol industry with many campaigners pressing for stronger statutory controls in a number of areas. The pressure seems likely to continue and intensify. What is strange from the Panel's point of view is that the level of complaints coming to us has not increased commensurately. One might have expected more complaints about individual products and it would seem sensible for those with concerns to make greater use of the complaints procedure.

In terms of complaints dealt with, there have been two main categories:

- complaints about a Scottish brewer's products (Brewdog), namely Speedball and Tokyo\* which were both upheld. The company responded by launching a new product called Nanny State! Not surprisingly this all attracted a good deal of publicity.
- complaints about products sold in test tubes where two have been upheld (Rampant TT's and Mmwah!) and a number more are pending.

Another interesting complaint related to a Greene King promotion whereby customers were invited to buy three pints in order to receive a fourth one free. The complaint was not upheld. There were two complaints relating to appeal to under-18s and one of these, against Cornish Rattler which featured a cartoon snake on its packaging, attracted much publicity.

May I conclude by thanking the Panel and the Secretariat for their hard work and support over the year.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard Tilt". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

**Sir Richard Tilt**  
**Chairman of the Panel**  
March 2010



## Speedball

Brewdog

Final Decision: **20 January 2009**

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

"The name 'Speedball' is entirely inappropriate for an alcoholic drink as it is the name given to the extremely dangerous practice of combining heroin and crack cocaine to provide both a stimulant and sedative effect.

The product's label describes the drink as a 'class A ale' – another clear reference to illicit drugs. The company's website ([www.brewdog.com](http://www.brewdog.com)) goes on to use terms like 'up-down' and 'happy-sad' and the beer contains 'a vicious cocktail of active ingredients'."

### COMPLAINANT

Alcohol Focus Scotland

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.2(c) **UPHELD**

Under Code paragraph 3.2(f) and 3.2(j)

### **NOT UPHELD**

The company acknowledged that the name referred to a drug-taking activity but argued that it was appropriate to this product. This was because the product contained mild sedatives and mild stimulants. They maintained that the causes of alcohol and drug misuse were far deeper rooted than product names and suggested that by alluding to drug misuse in this way, they might even highlight this issue and help prevent it.

The Panel considered that the challenged claims clearly sought to present the product as akin to an illicit and dangerous drug. It believed this encouraged people to drink the product primarily for its psychoactive properties and considered this approach to be grossly irresponsible. It was concerned that the blurring of alcohol and illicit drugs in this way not only fostered inappropriate attitudes to drinking but furthermore trivialised drug misuse. It found the product's name, packaging and website in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(c).

The Panel considered that while the packaging and website were clearly in breach of the Code as stated above, the challenged claims did not necessarily encourage immoderate consumption nor suggest that the product would enhance mental or physical performance (though it clearly implied that the former would be affected). Accordingly, the Panel did not find the product's packaging or website to be in breach of Code paragraphs 3.2(f) or 3.2(j).

### ACTION BY COMPANY

The company said they would change the name of the product to Dogma.



## Baby Blue & Baby Pink

Alcohol Brands Ltd

Final Decision: **10 March 2009**

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

“In our view, the product ... could appeal to under-18s. It is difficult to see ... that the product is alcoholic as the ABV of 4% is on the neck of the label.”

### COMPLAINANT

Gin and Vodka Association of Great Britain

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.2(h) **UPHELD**

Under Code paragraph 3.1 **NOT UPHELD**

The company maintained that the labelling on both Baby Blue and Baby Pink clearly indicated that the products contained alcohol. The Panel concurred, noting that the alcoholic strength statement on the relatively uncluttered front label was supplemented by further references on the back label. Accordingly, the Panel did not find the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.1.

The company denied that the packaging appealed particularly to under-18s. They acknowledged that the product was promoted on the basis of its relatively low calorie content but maintained that this attribute was of appeal to all ages, not under-18s in particular. The Panel, however, considered that the names “Baby Blue” and “Baby Pink”, in combination with the bright blue and pink colours, gave the products a childish feel that would appeal particularly to under-18s, and particularly girls. Furthermore, this appeal was exacerbated by the packaging’s emphasis upon calorie content and by the childish font in which the brand name was written. Accordingly, the Panel found the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(h).

### ACTION BY COMPANY

The company agreed to amend the product’s packaging in consultation with the Portman Group’s Advisory Service.



## Rampant TT's

247 Enterprises Ltd

Final Decision: 16 April 2009

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

"In our view, the product contravenes the Portman Group Code because the name implies a lack of restraint... The website [www.rampantontour.co.uk] associates with sexual success and has images implying excessive drinking (e.g. someone carrying a poster stating "I'm off my tits")... In our view the attached poster also contravenes the Portman Group Code in a number of ways, principally its relationship between the product and sexual prowess."

### COMPLAINANT

Gin and Vodka Association of Great Britain

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.1 and 3.2(d), (e), (f), (g) and (i) **UPHELD**

The company said that they had had some teething problems with the marketing of their product which was a vodka-based flavoured drink with an ABV of 15% and packaged in 20ml test tubes. They said they had replaced their marketing team and maintained that they would be following the Portman Group Code more carefully in future.

The Panel considered that the alcoholic nature of the drink was not clear from its packaging. Accordingly, the Panel found the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.1.

The Panel furthermore noted that the test-tube container could not be set down on its base on a flat surface. While noting that the product could in theory be re-sealed, the Panel nonetheless considered that the test-tube packaging format was effectively urging down-in-one consumption. The Panel accepted that the alcoholic content of a single container was moderate (approx 0.3 of a unit) but was concerned that this was a style of consumption that was unwise and which the Code was seeking to prevent. Accordingly, the Panel found the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(g).

Given that the product was in breach of the Code for urging down-in-one consumption, the Panel considered it was also encouraging irresponsible consumption. Accordingly, the Panel found the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(f).

With regard to the poster, the Panel noted that this featured an image of the drink being poured into bottles of RTDs beneath the statement: "Make anything Rampant, have a swig and pour it in Smirnoff Ice, WKD, Lager, anything!" Alongside was a picture of a young woman in a bikini with her fingers inside the bikini bottom.

The Panel noted that "Rampant" had various meanings, including "unrestrained". It nonetheless considered that, in itself, the name was not necessarily in breach of the Code. In the context of this poster, however, the term "rampant" in combination with the provocative image of the woman carried sexual connotations. Accordingly, the Panel found the poster in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(d).

The Panel was further concerned at the poster's advocacy of pouring the Rampant drink into a bottled drink. While noting the company's argument that this was moving people away from downing the test-tube in one, it was concerned that it constituted the "spiking" of another alcoholic drink to make it stronger. The Panel considered that this was encouraging irresponsible and immoderate consumption. Accordingly, the Panel found the poster in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(f).

With regard to the website, the Panel noted that this featured various photographs of people at Rampant promotional events. Some of the people were holding signs including, for example, a young woman holding a sign stating "I'm off my tits". The company said that they had not been responsible for producing these signs and that they had removed problematic images from the website following notification of the complaint.

The Panel considered that the photographs featured people behaving in a sexually suggestive way, people who were apparently drunk, and people who looked under 25 years old. The Panel furthermore considered that the photographs implied that consumption of Rampant would lead to social success or popularity. The Panel accordingly found the website in breach of Code paragraphs 3.2(d), (e), (f) and (i).

### ACTION BY COMPANY

The company did not respond. A Retailer Alert Bulletin was issued and the product seems no longer to be on sale.



## Green King's Beer Promotion

Greene King Brewing Company

Final Decision: 27 April 2009

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

"Joe goes into the pub for a couple of pints! He is told that he can have a fourth one free. I believe this is an unacceptable encouragement leading him to drink more than he might. After he has had his 2 pints he thinks I'm only 1 off reaching my free pint so I'll have the 3rd and then I can utilise the 4th..."

I have nothing against the promotion of beer with reduction in prices but this is not the same. The offer depends and is linked to consumption and dents the aspiration of responsible drinking."

### COMPLAINANT

Member of the public

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.2(f) **NOT UPHELD**

The company explained that the promotion had been undertaken in January in association with 400 Greene King pubs and would have lasted for no more than 2 weeks in participating outlets. The promotion mechanic required consumers to buy three pints from a range of Greene King beers in order to receive a fourth pint free of charge. The consumer was given a collector card on which they were required to obtain a member of staff's signature as proof of purchase of each of the three pints in order to claim their free pint. This allowed the consumer to spread their participation in the promotion over the course of three, or indeed four, visits to the pub. The company said that when they ran such promotions, they normally included a standard

condition stating "A maximum of two signatures can be obtained per person per session"; they provided examples of previous promotional material to demonstrate that this was the case. On this occasion, they inadvertently omitted to include this condition on promotional material. They nonetheless maintained that this did not cause the promotion to be irresponsible and that they would encourage and expect participating licensees to observe the law and not serve anyone who was drunk.

The Panel recognised the concern over on-trade promotions offering an incentive to purchase extra volume of alcohol. It noted, however, that the collector-card mechanic of this promotion meant that a consumer was not compelled to purchase and/or consume an excessive volume of alcohol in a single session. It further noted that there was nothing in the presentation of the promotion to encourage or imply immoderate consumption. The Panel considered that it would have been preferable for the terms and conditions to have included a restriction on the number of qualifying purchases per person per day. The Panel also considered, however, that consumers should take a degree of personal responsibility for their own drinking behaviour and therefore decided, despite the omission of the condition, that the promotion and its presentation were not encouraging immoderate consumption. It accordingly did not uphold the complaint.

### ACTION BY COMPANY

None needed



## MmWah!

Harwood Drinks

Final Decision: 14 October 2009

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

“Alcohol Focus Scotland would like to complain about this drink in relation to clauses 3.2(f) and (g) of the Portman Group’s Code of Practice which state that a drink, its packaging and any promotional activity should not encourage irresponsible consumption or urge the consumer to drink rapidly or to “down” a product in one.

MmWah! is sold in test tube packaging which is clearly designed to be downed in one rather than sipped. The design of the packaging is obviously intended to appeal to young women with its pink lipstick mark and brightly coloured fruity flavours like passion and cherry.

The website refers to sales tools including shooter belts for a salesperson to promote the shots in bars. It also states that they “are a fun addition to any drinking experience” and “they are bought in addition to existing drinks, not as a replacement”. We are concerned that this type of product and promotion means people are being encouraged to buy and drink more alcohol than they intended.

It is the view of Alcohol Focus Scotland that this product does not promote a positive message of safe and responsible drinking and clearly breaches the Portman Group’s Code of Practice.”

### COMPLAINANT

Alcohol Focus Scotland

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.1 **NOT UPHELD**

Under Code paragraph 3.2(f), (g) and (h) **UPHELD**

The company maintained that they avoided any encouragement of irresponsible consumption in their promotional material and that they sold the product only to licensed bars or clubs which prevented under-18s from accessing the product. They said that in response to the complaint they had made certain changes to the website, including the removal of the images of “shooter belts” and the description of the drinks as a “fun addition”, and the inclusion of a statement encouraging responsible drinking. They furthermore were in the process of changing the secondary packaging to remove the image of pink lips. They did not consider, however, that the product or its promotion was in breach of the Code.

The Panel noted that the test tubes stated “flavoured alcoholic drink” quite prominently immediately below the brand name. The Panel considered that, in view of the limited space available, the company had taken reasonable steps to ensure the packaging communicated the alcoholic nature of the drink. Accordingly, the Panel did not find the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.1.

The Panel noted that the test-tube container could not be set down on its base on a flat surface. While noting that the product could in theory be re-sealed and

stood upside down on its lid, the Panel nonetheless considered that the test-tube packaging format was effectively urging down-in-one consumption. The Panel accepted that the alcoholic content of a single container was moderate (approximately 0.3 of a unit) but was concerned that this was a style of consumption that was unwise and which the Code was seeking to prevent. Accordingly, the Panel found the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(g).

Furthermore, the Panel noted from the original website material that the product was clearly designed to encourage additional alcohol consumption among on-trade clientele. It considered that the whole idea of the product was to drive incremental consumption through an inappropriate drinking style (i.e. “down-in-one”). Accordingly, the Panel considered the product was encouraging irresponsible, excessive consumption and found it in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(f).

The Panel also considered that the novel nature of the product’s packaging, in combination with the bright colour of some of the flavour variations and the bright lips on the display box, would cause the product to have a particular appeal to under-18s. It noted the company’s argument about their sales policy but further considered that once the company had sold stocks of the product to another company, it had no control over the channels through which that stock might subsequently be sold. Accordingly, the Panel found the product in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(h)

#### **ACTION BY COMPANY**

The company has said that it will consult with the Portman Group’s Code Advisory Service.



## Tokyo\*

Brewdog

Final Decision: **3 December 2009**

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

"Tokyo\* has been widely promoted by BrewDog as the 'UK's strongest beer at 18.2% abv'.

Their press release states: 'The brewery, which caused public outcry from health campaigners when it launched Tokyo last year at 12% has brewed Tokyo\* at a stronger ABV level...'

And the company's website ([www.brewdog.com](http://www.brewdog.com)) says about Tokyo: 'Everything in moderation, including moderation itself. What logically follows is that you must, from time, [sic] have excess. This beer is for those times.'

It is the view of Alcohol Focus Scotland that this product does not promote a positive message of safe and responsible drinking and clearly breaches the Portman Group's Code of Practice."

*Alcohol Focus Scotland*

"I object to the part on the label text ['Everything in moderation etc'] which actively encourages people to drink to 'excess' and binge drink on this beer. This is highly irresponsible for any beer, especially so for a beer of this strength.

I also feel 'intergalactic fantastic' points towards hallucinogenic qualities."

*Member of the public*

### COMPLAINANT

Alcohol Focus Scotland; member of the public

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.2(a); 3.2(c) **NOT UPHELD**

Under Code paragraph 3.2(f) **UPHELD**

The company did not respond to the complaint.

The Panel noted that the Code did not seek to prohibit products simply on the basis of their alcoholic strength; instead, it sought to prevent companies from irresponsibly using strength as the primary basis of a product's promotion. The Panel considered that the product's packaging did not unduly emphasise its strength. Accordingly, it did not find the product's packaging in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(a).

The Panel considered that the expression "intergalactic fantastic" was unlikely to be seen as alluding to illegal drugs or their effects. Accordingly, it did not find the product's packaging in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(c).

The Panel noted, however, that the bottle label featured the statement: "Everything in moderation, including moderation itself. What logically follows is that you must, from time, [sic] have excess. This beer is for those times." The Panel considered that this was advocating excessive consumption and furthermore considered that this was particularly unwise in the context of a product that contained six units of alcohol in a single 330ml bottle. Accordingly, it found the product's packaging in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(f).

### ACTION BY COMPANY

The company agreed to amend the packaging in consultation with the Portman Group's Advisory Service.



## Cornish Rattler Cyder

Healey's Cornish Cyder Farm

Final Decision: **10 December 2009**

### COMPLAINT SUMMARY

"I wish to complain about the use of a cartoon character on the bottles and bar promotional material for Cornish Rattler Cider... The bottles and brand identity feature a cartoon snake character in dark glasses displaying a look of bravado, and which I believe has a particular appeal to under 18s. The character is especially similar to the cartoon characters 'Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles' which is popular among pre-teen children... You can see more images at the official website: <http://www.cornishrattler.co.uk>"

### COMPLAINANT

Member of the public

### DECISION

Under Code paragraph 3.2(b) **NOT UPHELD**

Under Code paragraph 3.2(h) **UPHELD**

The company explained that the Rattler was a Cornish variety of cider apple and they adopted this name to reference their Cornish heritage and identity. They subsequently decided to play on this brand name and make their brand more memorable through use of a snake image. They said they deliberately avoided a lifelike snake image in case its venomous connotations led to the wrong image they wanted for their brand.

Instead, they opted for a fictional, friendly image and gave it sunglasses and a beach background to reinforce the association with Cornwall.

The company argued that snakes generally did not have associations with bravado and that the image on their product certainly did not carry this association. The Panel concurred and accordingly did not find the product's packaging in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(b).

The company maintained that Cornish Rattler Cyder was a premium product marketed to over-18s only. They denied that the snake image would have particular appeal to under-18s and pointed out a number of stylistic differences between their snake character and the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles. The Panel, while acknowledging these differences, nonetheless considered that the prominence and nature of the snake image caused the packaging to have a particular appeal to under-18s. Accordingly, it found the product's packaging in breach of Code paragraph 3.2(h).

### ACTION BY COMPANY

The company agreed to amend the packaging in consultation with the Portman Group's Advisory Service.

# Retailer Alert Bulletins

If a product's packaging or point-of-sale material is found in breach of the Code, the Portman Group takes compliance action by issuing a Retailer Alert Bulletin (RAB) asking licensees to de-stock the offending product/materials after a specified period, normally of three months. RABs are published in the licensed trade press and on the Portman Group's website and are sent to Code Signatories, police licensing officers, Trading Standards Officers, local licensing authorities and other interested parties nationwide.

PRODUCT	RAB ISSUED	COMPLIANCE DEADLINE
Baby Blue & Baby Pink	March 2009	10 June 2009
Rampant TT's	May 2009	30 June 2009
Mmwah!	October 2009	22 December 2009
Tokyo*	December 2009	3 March 2010
Cornish Rattler Cyder	December 2009	10 March 2010

# How to make a complaint under the Code

Details of the complaints process are given in our 'Guide to Complaints' leaflet, available free of charge from the Portman Group (address and telephone number below). Copies of the Code of Practice are also available from the same address on request.

The Portman Group's Code of Practice encourages drinks producers to market their products responsibly. A product might contravene the Code if its name, packaging or marketing:

- does not make it clear that it's an alcoholic drink;
- appeals particularly to under 18s;
- emphasises the alcoholic strength unduly;
- links the product with illicit drugs;
- associates the product with sexual success;
- suggests bravado, violence, dangerous or anti-social behaviour;
- makes you think that drinking it will help you become popular or successful;
- encourages illegal or irresponsible drinking, such as binge drinking or drink-driving;
- uses inappropriate images of people under 25;
- suggests it can improve your mental or physical performance;
- urges consumers to drink rapidly or down their drinks in one.

The Code applies to a drink's packaging, (including its brand name) and also to point-of-sale activities and materials, brand websites, sponsorship, branded merchandise, press releases, advertorials and sampling.

If you wish to make a complaint under the Code, please write to the **Secretary to the Independent Complaints Panel** at the **Portman Group, 4th Floor, 20 Conduit Street, London W1S 2XW**.

If you would like to discuss any aspect of the complaints procedure, you are welcome to telephone **020 7290 1460**. Alternatively you can send an email to **info@portmangroup.org.uk**

# The Independent Complaints Panel

The membership of the Independent Complaints Panel represents a diversity of background and experience and does not include any person employed by the Portman Group or by any of its member companies.

The Panel's procedures are set out in our 'Guide to Complaints' leaflet which is available from the Portman Group on 020 7290 1460. Each complaint is considered carefully on its own merits.



## **Sir Richard Tilt** (Chairman)

Started his career in the Prison Service as Assistant Governor in 1966. He was Governor of a number of prisons including Bedford and Gartree. Appointed Director General of the Prison Service in 1995. Sir Richard retired from the Prison Service in 1999 and in the same year was appointed a Knight Bachelor.

From November 1999 – March 2000, he was Chairman of Kettering General Hospital NHS Trust, prior to taking up post as Chairman of Northamptonshire Health Authority in April 2000. In 2002 he was appointed chairman of Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Rutland Strategic Health Authority. He was a member of the Sentencing Advisory Panel from 1999–2002.

In December 2000 Sir Richard was appointed as Social Fund Commissioner for Great Britain and Northern Ireland. He was appointed Chairman of the Social Security Advisory Committee with effect from 1 January 2005.



## **Jon Eggleton**

Appointed to the role of United Biscuits UK Marketing Director in December 2003. Previously 15 years' experience within the drinks industry, most recently as a plc main board Marketing Director at HP Bulmer until October 2003. Prior to Bulmers, 11 years at Diageo/Guinness in a variety of marketing roles in the UK and overseas as Director of Marketing for Guinness Asia Pacific.



## **Laura Hyrapetian**

Fifth year medical student from Brighton and Sussex Medical School. BSc First Class Honours in Pharmacological Sciences. National Steering Committee Representative for the Student Stop AIDS Campaign.



## **Fiona Lewis**

Graduated from Warwick University with a Sociology and Social Policy degree in 2006. Has been a Sociology teacher at Woodhouse College, North Finchley since qualifying from the Institute of Education in 2007. Is also College Council Co-ordinator and jointly runs the Duke of Edinburgh Silver Award.



### **Nigel Long**

Non-executive advisor to Naked (communications strategy company), Partners Andrews Aldridge (relationship marketing company) and Harringtons. Previously over 20 years' experience in the advertising industry including the creative agencies WCRS and Partners BDDH where he was Managing Director from 1995 and Chairman & CEO from 2001. After 10 years, and having successfully completed the merger of Partners BDDH and Euro RSCG (to create the UK's 6th largest ad agency), Nigel left in March 2004 and took a six month sabbatical.



### **Barbara O'Donnell**

Appointed National Alcohol Liaison Officer for Scotland in February 2002 with a remit to administer the Scottish Association of Alcohol Action Teams (now the Scottish Association of Alcohol and Drug Action Teams). Prior to this appointment Barbara managed the Scottish Executive and Health Scotland's public education campaign, Drinkwise, for five years. Currently a member of the Education Core Group of the International Council on Alcohol & Addictions.



### **Reverend Canon Professor Martyn Percy**

Principal of Ripon College Cuddesdon, Oxford. Also visiting Professor of Theology and Ministry, Hartford Seminary, Connecticut; Professor of Theological Education, King's College, London and Canon Theologian, Sheffield Cathedral. Since his ordination in 1990 has occupied academic posts at Christ's and Sidney Sussex colleges, Cambridge, the University of Sheffield and Lincoln Theological Institute for the Study of Religion and Society. Worked as Academic Advisor on the Spirit Zone project in the Millennium Dome and presently sits on the Church of England's Faith and Order Advisory Group.



### **Stephen Robinson**

Currently the Director of Student Services for De Montfort University, which offers a wide range of advice and guidance to students. Previously 21 years within the public, private and Higher Education sector covering a wide range of disciplines primarily focusing on operations and customer services.

# The Portman Group's Code Advisory Service

As part of its responsibility in operating the Code of Practice, the Portman Group offers a free, fast and confidential Advisory Service.

The service gives drinks producers, importers and retailers the opportunity to seek advice, in advance, about the packaging and below-the-line marketing of any pre-packaged alcoholic drink that is to be sold in the UK. This enables any concerns about any possible breaches of the Code to be discussed and dealt with at an early stage.

Seeking advice can help companies to avoid the expense and bad publicity of having to make changes in response to an upheld decision by the Panel in the event of a complaint.

Companies wishing to seek advice under the Code should contact us by telephone on **020 7290 1460** or by email on **[advice@portmangroup.org.uk](mailto:advice@portmangroup.org.uk)** with details of their plans.

Over 130 companies have signed up to the Portman Group Code of Practice to indicate their support for the Code and their willingness to abide by and, in the case of retailers, help enforce, the decisions of the Independent Complaints Panel.

10 International Ltd	First Choice Wholesale Foods	Maxxium UK Ltd
Adnams plc	First Drinks Brands Ltd	McMullen & Sons Ltd
Alcohols Ltd	First Quench Retailing	Meantime Brewing Company Ltd
Ampleforth Abbey Trading Ltd	Frederic Robinson Ltd	Merrydown plc
Arkell's Brewery Ltd	Fuller Smith & Turner plc	Miller Brands (UK) Ltd
ASDA Stores Ltd	G T News Ltd	Mitchells & Butlers plc
Association of Licensed Multiple Retailers	Global Brands Limited	Mitchells of Lancaster (Brewers) Ltd
Avery's of Bristol Ltd	George Bateman & Son Ltd	National Association of Cider Makers, The
Babco Europe Ltd	Gin & Vodka Association of Great Britain, The	Nisa-Today's (Holdings) Ltd
Bacardi Martini	Gray & Sons (Chelmsford) Ltd	Northern Ireland Drinks Industry Group
Beam Global Spirits & Wine	Greene King plc	Oddbins Ltd
Beverage Brands (UK) Ltd	H&A Prestige Packing Company Ltd	Palmer & Harvey McLane Ltd
Black Sheep Brewery plc, The	Halewood International Ltd	Pernod Ricard UK
Blavod Drinks Ltd	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	Punch Taverns
Booker plc	Harvey & Sons (Lewes) Ltd	Rank Group
British Beer & Pub Association	Hayman Ltd	Reformed Spirits Company, The
Brothers Drinks Co. Ltd	Heavitree Brewery plc, The	Rubicon Research Ltd
Brown Forman	Hi-Spirits Ltd	S A Brain & Co. Ltd
Bulmers Ltd	Hook Norton Brewery Co. Ltd	Scotch Whisky Association, The
Burn Stewart Distillers	Hyde's Brewery Ltd	Scottish & Newcastle plc
Cains Beer Company plc	Ian Macleod Distillers Ltd	Sharp's Brewery
Caledonian Brewing Company Ltd, The	Icon Distillers UK	Shepherd Neame Brewery Ltd
Carlsberg UK	InBev UK Ltd	Shooters UK Ltd
Carnivale Brands	Intercontinental Brands (ICB) Ltd	Somerfield Stores Ltd
Castle Brands Spirits Group GB Ltd	Inver House Distillers Ltd	Sovio Wines Ltd
Cellar Trends Ltd	J Chandler & Co (Buckfast) Ltd	Speyside Distillers Co Ltd
Charles Wells Ltd	JC & RH Palmer Ltd	St Austell Brewery Co. Ltd
Cobra Beer Ltd	JD Wetherspoon plc	Timothy Taylor & Co. Ltd
Cocktail Mania Ltd	John E Fells & Sons Ltd	Tesco Stores Ltd
Constellation Wines Europe Ltd	Joseph Holt plc	Test Tube Products Ltd
Continental Wine & Food Ltd	J Sainsbury plc	Universal Brand Ltd
Co-operative Group, The	JW Lees & Co (Brewers) Ltd	Vickery Wines Ltd
Coors Brewers Ltd	J Wray & Nephew (UK) Ltd	Wadworth & Co. Ltd
Costcutter Supermarkets Group Ltd	Kingsland Wines and Spirits	Waitrose Ltd
Daniel Batham & Son Ltd	Lanchester Wine Cellars Ltd	Wells & Youngs Ltd
Daniel Thwaites & Co. Ltd	Landmark Cash & Carry Ltd	Welsh Whisky Company Ltd, The
De Vere Group plc t/a G & J Greenall	London & Scottish International Ltd	WH Brakspear & Sons plc
Diageo Great Britain	Maclay Group plc	Whiskynet
Edrington Group, The	Majestic Wine Warehouses Ltd	Whitbread Group plc
Ehrmanns Ltd	Marblehead Brand Development Ltd	Whittalls Wines Ltd
Elgood & Sons Ltd	Marks and Spencer plc	Whyte & Mackay Ltd
Enterprise Inns plc	Marston's Inns and Taverns	William Grant & Sons Distillers Ltd
Everards Brewery Ltd	Marston's plc	Wine and Spirit Trade Association, The
F&B Partnership Ltd, The	Marston's Pub Company	Wm Morrison plc
Federation of Wholesale Distributors, The	Martin Mccoll	Wye Valley Brewery
Felinfoel Brewery Co. Ltd, The	Matthew Clark Wholesale Ltd	Young & Co's Brewery plc

Portman Group  
4th Floor  
20 Conduit Street  
London W1S 2XW

T 020 7290 1460  
F 020 7290 1470  
[info@portmangroup.org.uk](mailto:info@portmangroup.org.uk)  
[www.portmangroup.org.uk](http://www.portmangroup.org.uk)