

AB-INBEV, CARLSBERG, HEINEKEN AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL BREWERS ARE YET AGAIN IN 2008-9 BEHAVING BADLY TO WOMEN BEER SELLERS IN CAMBODIA.

Ian Lubek¹

Professor, Psychology Department, University of Guelph, Canada
Visiting Professorial Fellow, National Center in HIV Social Research,
University of New South Wales, Australia,
International Advisor, SiRCHESI, Cambodian NGO # 704,
Siem Reap Citizens for Health, Educational and Social Issues

In a series of lectures in 2009, Ian Lubek is reporting to audiences in the UK, Spain, Switzerland, New Zealand and Australia, the latest research findings from a study begun in 2000– of the health and safety of women selling international beer brands in Cambodia. These findings, collected by a group of international researchers and local, trained interviewers from the SiRCHESI NGO (www.angkorwatngo.com), have been reported in scientific publications and on relevant websites, and disseminated directly to union groups, the press¹, beer company executives and shareholders.²

Despite reassurances to journalists and shareholders from some brewers, the SiRCHESI data³ confirm that **in 2008, the major beer brands in Cambodia have again not succeeded this past year in improving the dangerous, unhealthy and potentially mortal workplace conditions for women beer sellers**, who compete nightly to sell their flagship and partner brands.⁴ Our data concern over 30 major brands that “behave badly” to their Cambodian beer sellers.⁵

1) Why are beer sellers at risk for HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted infections(STIs)?

The Cambodian government has tracked the beer sellers as one of the high risk groups⁶ for HIV/AIDS since 1995 (NCHADS, 2003), as has the international press from 1998 onwards. According to local medical personnel fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic since the 1990s, death in Cambodia might follow diagnosis by less than 2 years, hastened by a range of endemic and opportunistic tropical infections. With anti-retroviral therapy (ARVT) or Highly Active ARVT (HAART) not available in Cambodia until 2003, unless companies with strong HIV/AIDS policies for their workers (e.g., Heineken, SAB-Miller) stepped up and offered these life-saving treatments for free, many infected women would die.⁷ Why then are women, who are remunerated for full-time beer-selling, becoming infected with HIV/AIDS? Our data has conclusively shown since 2002 (McCourt, 2002; Schuster, 2006, Pagnutti, 2006) that when companies consistently pay beer sellers only half of what they need monthly to support their families, all must scramble to find extra income, and some are forced to sell sex occasionally. The women (N= 250) are constantly fearful that they are at risk for HIV/AIDS: before 2006 67% felt at risk; in 2007-9, now 65% feel at risk for HIV/AIDS. For a beer company promoting social responsibility, this may create a dilemma, when sex is perceived by the shareholders and the public as being used to market beer, and the sex is “dangerous” and

¹The author alone takes full responsibility for the statements in this press release, but wishes to acknowledge a large team of international collaborators for their assistance in data collection, analyses and dissemination: In Cambodia: Sarath Kros, Tim Tra, Sary Pen, Virakboth Huot, Houl Hav, Sohon Sros, Sophear Phal, Sophiap Prem, Vanna Ma, Bory Ou, Noeun Pring, Kris Sokhouth Huon, To Chantel; in Canada: Gabe Pollock, Suzanne Kiani, , Katie O'Brien, Stacy Niemi, Ellyn Braun, Shelly Burton, Sabina Bashir, Jessica Cadesky, Trisha Pagnutti, Jillian Schuster; In Singapore: Pauline Lim Sheng Ming, Gan Jian Wei, Lakshmi Ganapathi, Mee Lian Wong; In Australia, Chris Winkler, Elizabeth Kirkwood, Nathalie Lim, Brett Dickson, Neela Griffiths; from Europe and UK: Rob Bleijerveld, Tiny van Merode, Roel Idema, Helen Lee.

possibly fatal, when HIV/AIDS is contracted. Each company must deal with the impact of continuing revelations (and hence negative evaluations by shareholders and press) that many of their logo-bearing uniformed beer-sellers are forced by their salary and job conditions to sell sex to make ends meet, often in an unsafe manner after forced heavy drinking with customers, further putting these women at increased on-the-job health and safety risks. As one Australian brewery's head of Corporate Relations said in 2003: "We can't have prostitutes selling the national icon". **Yet, steadfastly, the major brewers have all, since 2002, refused to match the remuneration to the women's monthly expenses, i.e., refuse to pay a "living wage", which would remove the need for any part-time sex work.** With their full-time jobs paying only half of their monthly needs, some (from 28- 71%, depending on the study) now accept propositions several times a month from customers to have sex in exchange for money, when economic necessity dictated⁸. In a study by CARE International (Klincker, 2005), 38% reported being coerced to have sex right in the workplace, itself⁹.

The health risks for these women are therefore greatly compounded:

- i) having sex with multiple partners in the midst of an AIDS pandemic – with Cambodia showing the highest prevalence rates in South East Asia in the early years of the new millennium;
- ii) the arrival of over 2 million tourists in 2008, some sexual tourists;
- iii) coercion by the beer sellers' customers to over-drink, may lead to impaired judgement and risky sexual practices, e.g., forgetting condoms;
- iv) and if HIV/AIDS were not enough, excessive drinking and chronic alcoholism may result from their workplace pattern of drinking hazardous and harmful amounts of alcohol – for some, more than 9 standard units (drinks) nightly, 27 days monthly;
- v) both the HIV virus and Fetal Alcohol Syndrome represent threats to their newborns, as well.

2) What has been done about workplace health and safety and why should needed health interventions for employees take 7 years to organize?

In late 2006, Cambodian industry leaders Heineken and Carlsberg and their partners, with 70-80% of the market, formed BSIC (Beer Selling industry Cambodia), a professional association to deal with industry issues such as "pirate beer brands" as well as to regulate the health and safety of their beer sellers with a Code of Conduct¹⁰.

Since the introduction of the CODE of CONDUCT in October, 2006, SiRCHESI data shows no major significant changes in health and safety indicators during 2007, nor during 2008 (and a small sample in 2009).

While some improvement in company supplied uniforms did occur rapidly,

- i) workplace hazards have not been significantly reduced,
- ii) health education is not sufficient or efficient,
- iii) women still drink nightly and excessively, and sit with customers,
- iv) copies of employment contracts are not provided,
- v) job satisfaction and self esteem have decreased,
- vi) salaries remain (since 2002) still at half the beer sellers' cost of living,
- vii) the "fixed salary" system adversely deprives BSIC sellers of about 90% of potential income (compared to non-BSIC commissions for sales).
- viii) despite an industry leading HAART program for HIV+ workers since 2002, no beer sellers have been offered this in Cambodia, although some sellers who have died since 2002, might have benefited See memorial list; (www.beergirls.org); about 2/3 of the deceased women worked for Heineken, Tiger and partner brands. 8 women who died recently in 2007 and 2008 have been added.

The only major significant improvement recorded after the institution of BSIC was the increase in average nightly beer sales from 18.1 litres (2004-6, N=92) to 24.6 litres (2007-9, N=186) for

BSIC sellers, compared to the non-BSIC brand sellers (6.4 litres, N=121; and 4.2 litres, N=137 respectively). In the year 2008, BSIC sellers sold 26.0 litres nightly (N=95)).¹¹

In 2002 and 2003, contacts were made by SiRCHESI and by an ethical shareholders group (The Inter-Faith Centre on Corporate Responsibility) to major brewers, including Heineken, INBEV/Interbrew and Labbatt's (Canada), Foster's, and Annheuser Busch (now AB-INBEV). Each company did little or nothing to change the situation for beer sellers. Foster's ended its distributorship in Cambodia in 2003, as did Labbatt's. When Ceres faced criticism in the Danish press, it too ceased sales. Heineken explained its decisions not to take action in Cambodia in 2002, nor to move quickly nor unilaterally on implementing its own HAART policy. It reported that a pilot project in Africa, according to its 2002 policy, needed to be evaluated before any move into Cambodia.¹² The African program was finally pronounced a success 4 years later, and offered as a model for corporations to emulate in the fight against HIV/AIDS (van der Borght, et al, 2006). Free HAART is still not the case for Beer sellers in Cambodia, although some (male) engineers at partner Cambodian Breweries Ltd have had HAART access since 2003.

3) Health Hazards Intervention Programs: Ineffectively Implemented

In 2003, Heineken was the first to announce it had begun taking a series of steps to improve the situation, including creation of a health education program (Selling Beer Safely) and sponsorship of 3 excellent research surveys on workplace conditions with CARE international. (Quinn, 2003; Bury, 2005, Klincker, 2005 <http://www.fairtradebeer.com/FTBreports.html#carereports>) But by 2008, the efforts of their 3-day intensive health education program have seemingly become diluted, few Heineken and Tiger beer sellers after 2004 report having had such a thorough health and safety program, and many beer sellers receive only a short 1-2 hour workshop in the workplace, sometimes up to 6 months or more after they start work, nullifying any preventative health effects. SiRCHESI's peer educators try to contact new sellers in the workplace on their critical first day, to give them some health education information, albeit not as thorough as a 1-day, or 3-day workshop. CARE's International's studies outlined the workplace dangers faced nightly by Heineken beer-sellers and others, and confirmed independent data by SiRCHESI and other sources. 38% of the women reported being coerced into performing a sexual act in the workplace, 91% drank with their customers, only 19% were able to drink 1 or fewer cans (33cl) of beer nightly, 49% drank three or more, with 24% drinking more than 5 cans of beer a night --more than 1.65 litres or 7 standard drinks. By 2008, there had been little positive change in response to this reported dangerous workplace activity, except in the modification of some of the more demeaning uniforms worn by Heineken, Tiger and partner brands. Still only 6% of beer-sellers abstained from drinking with customers, and 94% continued drinking, on average, hazardous and harmful levels exceeding 5 standard drinks. In their workplaces, they face the compounded risks of HIV/AIDS transmission through unprotected sex with clients and nightly alcohol overuse in an environment where violence, harassment and sexual coercion are endemic. These women must be given strategies for avoidance of this potentially mortal combination of risks-- enforced by the beer companies and the restaurant managers-- and the education must be completed before the first work day. After 6 months to one year on the job, it's already too late. Cumulative alcohol effects of impairment and especially the danger during pregnancy, and the transmission of HIV/AIDS and STIs without proper prevention strategies, may have already taken their toll in the first 6 months of employment.

SiRCHESI's data show that of 224 Heineken family beer sellers (2004-2009), 16 (7.1%) received health training before they started, and a further 6 (2.7%) received it on the first day (or 9.8% received it in a timely, potentially effective manner).. In the midst of an HIV/AIDS epidemic with 21,7% of beer sellers HIV+ (1997-2003; NCHADS, 2003; van Merode et al, 2006) ¹³ compounded by high rates of alcohol overuse, **only those health programs occurring before the start of work are going to be effective in risk-prevention and harm-reduction.** Again,

when a brewer takes an industry-leading step forward, care must be taken so that it does not become procrastinatingly slow, nor diluted, untimely nor ineffective. Such a step should respond to the urgency of nightly life-and-death workplace health risks.

In a series of meetings with Carlsberg, Heineken and INVEV executives in 2005 and 2006, each company was challenged to become the vanguard brewer in Cambodia. When an important industry world leader and major Cambodian market player such as Carlsberg (50% of Cambodian market) or Heineken/Tiger (estimated 20-30%) takes a dramatic step in a marketplace, other brewers may competitively follow suit immediately. Most, like Heineken, decided on taking what might be called a “slow boat to Cambodia”: Wait the end of the African HIV/AIDS pilot program in 2006; wait the end of a 3-year health educational program evaluation (2003-2005); wait the formation of an alliance with other brewers (end of 2006) .

In fact, these decisions to postpone industry-leading proactive steps may in hindsight be viewed as diluting Heineken’s own initiatives and world leadership, in areas such as HIV/AIDS policy for workers. (See the discussion between van der Borgh et al, 2006 and Van Merode et al, 2006). All the while, names of deceased beer sellers were being added to the memorial at www.beergirls.org

4) BSIC: Can a professional association ensure that its Code of Conduct is being implemented in the workplace and that contracts are provided to workers transparently ?

Heineken, rather than acting unilaterally in Cambodia, taking a vanguard and pioneering action as in Africa, suggested that a better strategy was to wait until the formation of a professional association of brewers could collectively tackle these issues (and spread collectively any risks or damages?). BSIC first published its Code of Conduct for beer sellers in 2006, but only in English . In late 2008, they created their own website to supplement information available from alternative web resources such as www.bsicambodia.com and www.bsicambodia.org ¹⁴. Most beer-sellers in our workshops had reported never having seen a Khmer copy of the Code of Conduct until we began distributing them, in late 2008 and 2009.

The BSIC Code of conduct required companies to sign contracts with their salaried employees, under the Cambodian Labor Code. Long required under the Cambodian Labor Code¹⁵, they were not generally offered by beer companies to “promotion women” until late 2006 when the BSIC Code of Conduct was implemented, transforming women’s status (and budget line) from advertisements and promotions to salaried workers. In Siem Reap, contracts have reportedly been signed by 2 BSIC brand beer sellers, out of 9 attending a March, 2009 workshop -1 Heineken/Tiger family and 1 Carlsberg- Angkor. Only one had obtained her own copy to study. Others could not recall the conditions of employment except for the monthly salary (\$60 or \$65); one mentioned a small bonus promised at the end of the year (\$15-35). One seller thought there might be a bonus for selling extra pitchers of draft beer nightly, but was vague about details. It is important to know, in Cambodia, the number of days of paid leave, public holidays, travel time for family weddings, severance pay, sick leave, maternity leave, a company’s international health plan, HAART. Of course, without seeing these contracts, neither the workers themselves, nor outside agencies, nor a brewer’s Human Resources Department can evaluate how well the contract respects employment policies, the Cambodian Labour Code¹⁶ and the OECD regulations for Dutch and other companies doing business in developing countries such as Cambodia.¹⁷

BSIC promised to monitor industry compliance to the Code of Conduct . From Dec. 2007-Mar., 2008, they hired the Centre for Advanced Studies¹⁸, a Cambodian NGO, to do an intensive audit, designed and carried out by Joanna White. However, only a short 3-page summary was made available to the press¹⁹ and there was no way to evaluate the methodology employed to interview 438 beer sellers²⁰. Some of the reported CAS AUDIT findings, at odds with other systematic research such as that of CARE and SiRCHESI, should perhaps be subject to broader critical examination and discussion, before being adopted by any of the BSIC

companies and their executives and further summarized for shareholders, as an “official response”, e.g., at an AGM.

5) Still no 'living' wages for beer sellers– BSIC workers paid less well than non-BSIC sellers

In May, 2008 a Dutch newspaper reported Heineken was paying a fixed monthly salary of \$85.²¹ This level of payment may well be **its intention** for 2009, but our interview indicators on the ground (N=256) showed otherwise. For the 50 Heineken family beer sellers specifically answering this question in 2008, their reported mean income received from their beer company was \$73.00 (just below the industry average for that year of \$74.80).²² The overall (N=256), average remuneration was \$70.55, but BSIC salaries averaged 66.97 compared to non-BSIC sellers receiving \$76.25 (with non-BSIC brands again paying over \$10 more per month).

Of course, **none of these salary amounts has ever been sufficient to cover the actual monthly average needs of the women of \$120.44 (McCourt, 2002²³ and SiRCHESI data from 2004-2009, N=510). This has increased to \$141.25 (N=303) for the period 2007-9.** A fair or “living wage” can be determined by an HR department assessment of monthly expenses and needs. These women on average are supporting 3.5 dependents. For the year 2008, we may, e.g., look at the Heineken family of brands, paying \$73.00 while their sellers reported needing \$149.05 each month to feed their family. Thus the 2008 salary received represents 49% of needed income, consistent with the “underpaid by half” figures reported industry-wide, ever since 2002 (McCourt) and replicated by our ongoing research. This is consistent with suggestions to major beer companies since 2002 to “double” the beer sellers’ salaries as a way to remove all economic pressure to sell sex, in order to make up the perpetual income gap.

6) HIV-AIDS prevalence rate still demands urgent action

In 2002, we suggested directly to Heineken and to the management of its exclusive Cambodian distributor, Attwood Import and Export, that daily ARVT could be made available in Phnom Penh for its HIV+ beer sellers, with the assistance of Médecins sans Frontières; it was then estimated that about 20% of the workforce would require this, consistent with the company’s HIV/AIDS policy. Heineken took no action at this time, insisting on the completion of the African pilot study before work in Cambodia could commence²⁴. By 2006, the Heineken African HAART program was declared a success and proposed as a model of corporate responsibility to be emulated world-wide. Heineken had also finished evaluating its HIV/AIDS Selling Beer Safely program in 2005 (CARE 2003, 2005a, 2005b), and additional SiRCHESI research supporting proactive intervention had been brought right to the front doors of major brewers, in presentations (2005 and 2006) at their headquarters.²⁵ By 2009, no beer sellers had been offered HAART by any beer companies, with or without international health and HIV/AIDS policies. By 2009, BSIC still does not have much infrastructure, nor has its Code of Conduct been enforced to produce dramatic health and safety changes for beer sellers. And the CODE says nothing about free HAART nor “living wages”.

While this seeming corporate “foot-dragging” continues, shareholders are able to consult the <http://www.beergirls.org> website which presents the memorial list of the beer sellers of Heineken, Tiger and partner brands who have died since 2002. From Cambodia, revenues continue to flow smoothly back to shareholders, but Heineken’s vanguard HIV/AIDS policy of 2002 has not yet benefited any of the women who generate 50% of beer sales. And some questions may again be asked at the AGM²⁶. Heineken's 2008 Annual Report does however state that "Our employees are our most important asset and we dedicate significant amounts of time and resources to their growth, development and well-being".²⁷ While on an earlier occasion, a Heineken public relations official once commented: “We are in the business of beer, not in medical care,” yet a more modern take on healthy workers linked to overall corporate profitability, was argued by Heineken scientists S. van der Borght et al (2006).²⁸

In 2006, figures were presented to Heineken, Carlsberg and INBEV directors indicating that the cost of doubling salaries to a living wage (from \$55 monthly then to \$110) and of providing HAART to 20% of the workforce was less than \$150,000 annually per 200 beer sellers (about the number of Heineken and INBEV sellers in Cambodia). This salary doubling would end the need for all of the women to take risks selling sex. **But this would alter the economics of beer selling, changing the cost to Heineken and Tiger and Carlsberg from 2.5% of the sales price to about 6.25% of sales, with consequently less profit for shareholders. INBEV and other non-BSIC brands paying \$8.00 per case in 2009 were actually paying close to 10 times more, per sale, i.e., 25% of the sale price to the beer seller.** (In most other markets we have examined, including Canada and Singapore, higher levels of “sales and distribution costs” frequently occur.) It was estimated in 2006 that each beer-seller then sold about \$25,000 annually, so the revenues from 6 of the 200 beersellers could finance the whole program. It was also pointed out that a policy of no drinking on the job would also effect overall sales, and there would be less profits for shareholders. In 2008, the average Heineken/Tiger family beer seller (N=97) sold 26.02 litres of beer nightly (3.25 cases), almost double the industry average of 15.62 litres). Each case of beer is 8 litres so the women, working 27 days will sell 703 litres or 87.8 cases monthly. With the retail sales price of \$30.00 per case in the restaurant, it is estimated that each beer seller produces monthly sales of \$2634 monthly or \$31,608 annually, up considerably from 2006. This they sell in 2008 for an average received fixed monthly salary of \$73.00 or 2.7% of the sales price (unchanged from 2006).

If the Heineken/Tiger beer sellers would have worked at the same commission rate as the non-BSIC beer-sellers, they would have earned \$8.16 (2008) per case or \$716.45 monthly, almost 10 times what the BSIC companies offer to their effective sales staff.²⁹ Perhaps by keeping costs low in Cambodia, a better return can be promised to the shareholder?. But is this the ethical and sustainable way to do business?

7) Drinking on the job, banned by BSIC in October 2006, is still very much a part of the problem

The nightly drinking of beer sellers, paid for by the customers, increases beer sales by about 7.4% overall (N=502 -we include abstainers as drinking 0.0 litres). This varies by beer-families, with BSIC brand sellers drinking about 5.9% of their elevated sales while non-BSIC sellers have drunk up to 34.2% of smaller nightly sales. Heineken's beer family sellers overall (N=201) drank 5.6% of their sales nightly. Their BSIC partner, Carlsberg, saw its sellers drink 7.8%. Beer sellers are frequently forced to drink with their customers, for fear of losing sales, even if they have a fixed salary which they would get paid no matter how much they sold. Only a few find it possible to abstain from drinking. Overall (2004-2009) 8.5% of the BSIC sellers (N=269) compared to 3.5% of non-BSIC sellers (N=258) reported abstaining from drinking in the workplace, i.e., having drunk no beer or alcohol (0 litres) on the previous 2 nights when they worked. All other beer sellers reported that they still continued to be currently drinking on the job.

Would shareholders agree to accept less profit from the Cambodian market, if beer-sellers stopped drinking, cold turkey, reducing nightly sales by about 6%? There may even be some additional expenses, as with all employee alcohol-assistance programs). It may be a challenge when 91% of your workforce regularly drinks heavily, 27 nights per month, and then must stop suddenly according to the BSIC policy. Would shareholders back a total ban on workplace drinking if they knew that the lost income was instead invested in the health and welfare of the Heineken beer sellers, actively reducing risks for mortality? And what can be done for the children of the beer-sellers? In 2009, SiRCHESI ran a trial clinic for 5 beer sellers who brought in 6 children for examination by a doctor. The women had been drinking on the job during pregnancy, unaware that in countries such as the US, bottles of Heineken in some states must contain a warning on the bottle for pregnant women to avoid drinking any alcohol. From just the symptomatic examination conducted -no invasive biological testing- one of the 6 children has been recommended for followup testing, to confirm Fetal Alcohol Syndrome. Here Heineken

and Tiger staff doctors in Phnom Penh and elsewhere might play a useful role screening for second-generation workplace hazards.

Why the delay, when data from CARE, SiRCHESI and others— going back to 1998³⁰ – signalled urgency, that beer-sellers were working in violent, unsafe work- places, being coerced into sex acts in the workplace and even gang-raped³¹.

8. BSIC vs non-BSIC BRANDS– ANY DIFFERENCES for THE BEER SELLERS?

Was the institution of BSIC the answer? In SiRCHESI's studies, comparisons are made on various health and safety indicators before and after the institution of BSIC. On almost all measures, no improvements were found for the BSIC brands from the pre-BSIC period (2004-2006) to the post BSIC period (2007-2009– with the majority of our sample taken in 2008). On some measures, the non-BSIC brands (including AB-INBEV, SAB-Miller and others) actually did better, e.g. regarding monthly income. There was little change up to 2009 in the amount of hazardous nightly drinking (5-8 standard drinks, 27 nights monthly) in which 93% of the sellers (2007-9) still engaged. For example, SiRCHESI found that the mean alcohol drunk per shift is actually higher for BSIC sellers in 2008 (1.48 litres nightly or 6 standard drinks, N=103) than before the BSIC CODE prohibited drinking on the job. In 2006, BSIC sellers drank 1.01 litres nightly or 4 standard drinks (N=27). And they continued to do this 27 nights monthly. It should be of little comfort to compare these BSIC hazardous drinking rates to those of the non-BSIC sellers. The latter were, in fact, higher (in 2006, they drank 1.84 litres nightly, N=42; and in 2008: 1.86 litres, N=81, both equivalent to 8 standard drinks nightly). The women do not eat before drinking, and their weight is about 70% of that of Western women, meaning they can absorb less alcohol **All of these levels, regardless of the statistically significant differences, are above the WHO guidelines for both harmful and hazardous drinking for women, with dangers of warning of organ damage, cognitive impairment, mental illness, social problems, etc.**³².

In addition, there are about 45 sites encouraging responsible drinking. The US Heineken website³³ for drinking responsibly recommends no more than 1 glass of beer daily (250 cl) for women, and 0 for pregnant women. In 2009, a Khmer language site devoted to responsible drinking was being advertised by posters in restaurants : www.enjoyheinekenresponsibly.com : Go to to win \$3888 in a contest!³⁴

SiRCHESI also took BAC (blood alcohol concentration) level readings in 2006 (before the Code of Conduct) and again in April and August 2008 (after the Code had been introduced, banning workplace drinking.). There were no significant differences among BSIC or non-BSIC sellers (N= 86) and the levels were identical, over time, hovering at the near-universal level for impairment of .05 mg/ml (BAC), with 2006 at 0.049 mg/ml and 2008, 0.048 BAC. The beer sellers still face increased risk for HIV/AIDS caused by alcohol-related judgment impairment. SiRCHESI's research has shown that when no alcohol is present, consistent condom use with "clients" reaches about 95%; after drinking alcohol (Pagnutti, 2006) , condom use slips to about 82%.

Women selling beer, when asked (N=256) whether "this job gives you good self-esteem and self-image" infrequently answered yes. Heineken sellers responded 11.3% yes (N=124), while Carlsberg responded 3.0% (N=33), INBEV 13.0% and others 3.9%. When asked: "Do you think this job empowers you as a person (makes you independent and strong)", the agreeing responses (N=256) were: 4% Heineken, 3% Carlsberg, 0% Inbev and 2.6% for other brands. When asked: Does this job give you a good social reputation in this town (N= 256), affirmative responses were 4.8% Heineken (N=124), 3% Carlsberg, 0% Inbev, and 2.6% for other non-BSIC brewers. When asked whether they felt safe in their workplace, only about half said yes (52.3%, N=279), with both Heineken and Carlsberg being slightly above the average (58,1% and 52.6%) while INBEV and Other Brands were below (44.4% and 45.9%). Overall, 10.1% have been physically hurt while at work (similar for all brands), while almost half (45.1%,

N=277) affirmed that they have been intimidated or threatened at work (Heineken 36.2%, Carlsberg 57.9%, INBEV 53.6% and other brand 50.0%).

These results are much less optimistic than the CAS internal audit for BSIC in 2008, and SiRCHESI suggests that all companies be wary that their employees may well be unhappy, not feeling particularly safe, insecure, feeling vulnerable to threats and intimidation, have low self-esteem, empowerment and social reputation when selling these international brands of beer. Finally, an unpublished thesis by Gabe Pollock (2008)³⁵ shows that when 25 beer sellers are taken out of their restaurants and trained for careers in the hotel industry, they quickly develop a very positive response on the above factors.

**PROACTIVE SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION OF BEER SELLERS:
Specifically directed at the upcoming Heineken AGM in April, 2009, but applicable
to all companies.**

1) Heineken, its BSIC partners and, eventually non-BSIC companies should **pay a “living wage”**. **For BSIC, this reflects its industry-leading sales but more importantly reflects the actual cost of living for its sales force (about \$140.00 monthly)**. If Heineken and Tiger beer-sellers were paid the current industry standard (2008) of just over \$8.00 per case as commission, they would earn- about \$700 per month. This would be about 10 times the current fixed salary, but still much less than beer-sellers are paid in other countries, selling the same volumes nightly. BSIC brand sellers are consistently paid less each month than non-BSIC brands yet increasingly sell manifold more beer each year. BSIC sellers get about 2.7% of their sales as salary; non-BSIC get about 25% of sales as commission (but sell less).³⁶ A part of the profitability from Cambodian sales is based on the beer sellers nightly consumption of about 6% of sales, which adds harm and risk to their working situation. **FOR ALL BEER BRANDS: CHANGE THE PAY STRUCTURE and SUPERVISE THE END OF WORKPLACE DRINKING.**

2) Heineken and partner brands should provide, as in Africa, **free HAART for their HIV+ beer sellers**. Most beer-sellers are currently excluded from the Government ARVT programs due to lack of transportation, while Heineken’s HIV/AIDS policy has promised coverage to all its workers world-wide.³⁷ Since the women work 27 days monthly, these should be daily distributed at Heineken and partner warehouses or distributorships, the workplace model already demonstrated effective in Africa (van der Borgh et al, 2006) **THIS SHOULD THEN BE EMULATED BY ALL OTHER NON-BSIC BRANDS.**

3) Heineken, partner brands and all others should also provide more effective workplace health and safety education about HIV/AIDS, reproductive health and alcohol risks **before employment begins**. **All beer sellers need timely information about the the risks and harm possible for themselves, damage to the fetus during pregnancy, or contraction of HIV/AIDS or a sexually transmitted infection.**³⁸ Only 9.8% received a timely, preventative message. 80/224 or 35.7% had received it in the next 6 months, while the remainder had training in the next 18 months or not at all (122 or 54.5%).

4) Heineken and all brands should provide to the beer sellers **copies of their work contracts specifying working conditions, and benefits** such as severance pay and maternity leave, and exact earnings— all, transparently. There is an important issue also for Heineken shareholders: for a number of years, Heineken officials reported paying bonuses to the beer servers, yet our interviews constantly showed, from 2002 onwards, that **these bonuses were reported as not being received by the beer sellers**. In fact, when they report their monthly earnings, they reported receiving less in 2008 (\$71.00) than non-BSIC sellers (84.00), and less than the \$85 Heineken headquarters reports (de Telegraaf, 2008)³⁹. As mentioned at Heineken headquarters in 2006, unless the beer sellers have a copy of their contract, know what their bonuses are, and

both the sellers and Heineken headquarters have **receipts showing where this bonus money has gone**, there is a chance that some or all of this money is disappearing in the organizational or distribution chain.

5) Heineken and all brands should **end all workplace drinking with revocation of brand sales where outlets continue to permit sellers sitting and drinking with clients**; When the BSIC policy finally (in 2006) says “No Drinking” but in 2008 and 2009 less than 10% of beer sellers are in fact abstaining, something is not working. This problem has long been resolved in neighbouring markets of Thailand and Singapore

6) Heineken and all other brands should be aware that **each time one of its beer sellers now follows the BSIC Code and refuses to drink with the customers, in many restaurants, a restaurant-employed hostess is picked by the customer to continue drinking all night**. The alcohol-abuse buck is being passed to another woman, unaware of the potential workplace health and safety risks. In 2008, we interviewed 63 hostesses, earning about \$2.00 per night. **They were drinking even more than the beer sellers, over 2.04 litres nightly, over 8 standard drinks. These substitutes for Heineken’s (and other companies’) sellers should also be offered alcohol and health education**. This new “career” is more dangerous, in that beer servers could leave the table to tend to other customers; a hostess is the drinking partner for the evening.

7) Heineken and all others should insist that **outlet security and safety supervision occur to reduce violence, harassment and unsafe working conditions in restaurants** serving Heineken and partner products. This should not be left to the independent restaurant owners and managers, as they are not the real employer of the beer seller. **Transportation home late at night, part of the BSIC CODE, was provided to only 52% of workers (N=254) overall, with BSIC workers doing slightly better in 2007-9, with 60.5% being transported home safely. All women need safe transport.**

8) Heineken should receive our **compliments for the progress towards one of the BSIC goals, to create more conservative uniforms**. This has been successfully implemented by Heineken and other BSIC brands. All companies should follow suit.

9) Heineken and all companies should provide **training and career escape routes for women who find the beer-selling environment unsafe, but who feel trapped because of illiteracy and lack of skills for other work**. SiRCHESI over a three year period was able to arrange for 25 women to leave beer-selling, and with daily literacy and English language training, they found safer, healthier and better-paying jobs in the hotel industry. The beer industry, rather than capitalizing on the women’s lack of education and keeping them at the bottom of the economic ladder, could be a vanguard industry for women, by improving the salaries, working conditions and the image of the beer-seller in the community. At the same time, Heineken could provide educational opportunities so that some might choose to graduate from the world of beer selling.

10) Heineken should improve its new **Khmer a website on Cambodian responsible drinking. But recommended drinking for women must be proportional to their smaller size compared to American women**. For women in general or those beer-sellers who still don’t abstain, drinking should be less than 2/3 glass (one half small can) nightly, and no more than 5 days weekly, after eating, and no drinking during pregnancy. This site, or the www.BSIC.com.kh site could also have a model beer-seller’s contract, a summary of the Labour Code, a copy of Heineken’s HIV/AIDS policy in Khmer, a copy of the BSIC Code of Conduct (in Khmer), etc. Other companies should provide Khmer information on health and safety for their sellers and consumers.

Contact for Press release and Information package:

Ian Lubek, PhD.

**Professor, Psychology Department, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1
Canada**

and Visiting Professorial Fellow, NCHSR, UNSW, Kensington, NSW 2052 Australia.

Contact: Email: ilubek@uoguelph.ca

SKYPE Phone: 33-(0)870445595 or ilubek

Australia Cellphone: 61- 04-10787100 (until May 15, 2009)

For information about NGO SiRCHESI, please visit www.angkorwatngo.com (See **Newsletter,2008.**) For specific information about the health and safety risks faced by Cambodian "beer selling women" and our health outreach and Hotel Apprenticeship programs, please visit www.beergirls.org , www.ethicalbeer.com , www.fairtradebeer.com and see also www.bsicambodia.com, www.bsicambodia.org .

ENDNOTES

1. <http://www.fairtradebeer.com/read/PressreleaseAPr14,2008.rtf>
2. The Annual General Meetings (AGMs) for shareholders to raise issues about the social responsibility, ethical and sustainable conduct of the companies are : 23 April, 2009 for Heineken, 28 April for AB-INBEV, and 13 July for SAB-Miller. Carlsberg's AGM occurred 12 March, 2009.
3. SiRCHESEI and associated researchers conducted over 1200 health interviews in Cambodia since 2000 with various risk groups. SiRCHESEI's health outreach program, using peer educators, reaches additional community members, including beer sellers, with 7718 contacts in 2008. Data reported here are from 537 interviews on HIV/AIDS and alcohol risks, conducted in the workplaces and health workshops, primarily in Siem Reap. This sample included 222 beer sellers of Heineken and partner brands Tiger, ABC Stout, Anchor, Guinness Stout, Cheers, Bintang, Kingway, Gold Crown; 57 worked for Carlsberg brands such as Angkor, Holsten, Hite, Lao Beer, Royal Stout. 58 were employed to sell AB-INBEV brands Budweiser, Bass, Cass, Beck's, Stella Artois, 3 Horses, Branik Special, Corona., Only 1 sold a SAB-Miller brand (Zorok), and the remaining 199 sold "Other brands", a category which included Dutch beers Bavaria and Hollandia, as well as San Miguel, Valor, Love, Jade, Gold, Singha, Leo, Mittweida, Pax, Oettinger, Asahi, Taiwan, etc (See full list at : www.fairtradebeer.com)
4. Beer industry officials in 2005 estimated there were at least 3827 beer sellers in Cambodia. In Siem Reap, about 275 beer sellers work, mean age 24.5 years, each supporting 3.5 dependents. There is much turnover among beer sellers; distributors told us that some women disappear to return to their rural villages. But their colleagues, who nurse them when they are too sick to work, have reported over 55 who have died, and their names are memorialized at www.beergirls.org, with their age, and the company they worked for. A 20% mortality rate--55/275-- may mirror the HIV seropositive prevalence rate among beer sellers of 21.7% (1995-2003, NCHADS, 2003)
5. There are an additional 20-25 brands available in stores that do not employ women beer-sellers. According to beer industry officials, the sellers may be responsible for about 50% of all sales in Cambodia.
6. Many of the women interviewed strongly disliked the government's and WHO's designation of them as "Indirect (commercial) Sex Workers"-- women who were not employed full-time in a brothel (Direct Sex Workers) but had a salaried/paying job such as karioke singer, masseuse, or beer seller.
7. Srei Neamb, 30, who sold Heineken's partner brand Anchor beer, was one of SiRCHESEI's first beer-seller peer educators in 2001-2002. She died unexpectedly just two weeks after our followup interview with her, where she seemed quite healthy and made plans to leave beer-selling. Her story is told at www.beergirls.org.
8. Schuster (2006) queried Canadian and Cambodian men, and Canadian and Cambodian women beer sellers about making ends meet at the end of the month. Only the Cambodian beer sellers indicated they would have to sell sex (71%) if they could not feed their families.

9. In the current SiRCHESI samples (N= 242), 29% reported they were sexually touched against their will and 9% reported they were coerced into workplace sexual acts by drunken customers.

10. ... “major breweries operating in Cambodia, Asia Pacific Breweries, Cambodia Brewery Limited, Cambrew Ltd., Carlsberg a/s, Guinness & Heineken International, established the Beer Selling Industry Cambodia (BSIC) with the objective of improving the health, safety and working conditions of beer promoters by setting industry standards.” (From www.bsic.com.kh), In SiRCHESI’s sample of 537 beer sellers, for some analyses we have divided the data set into two time frames, pre-and post-BSIC. 213 interviews were conducted in 2004-6; 324 in 2007-9. We also divide the sample into sellers working for companies belonging to BSIC (N=279) and those who work for non-BSIC companies (N=258). .

11. In 2007 and 2008, Heineken, their partners Asia Pacific Breweries, and Carlsberg (16%) each reported sales increases in Cambodia or the surrounding Indochina region (including Cambodia) of 14-17% (Heineken's Annual Reports, 2007, 2008; Carlsberg Annual Report, 2008; see also “Strong Fundamentals of Asia Pacific Breweries Drive Robust Revenue and PBIT Growth for the Group,” 14 November, 2008 <http://www.apb.com.sg/newsroom/news_081114.html>) In fact, SiRCHESI’s monitoring of nightly sales in Siem Reap bars and restaurants shows even more dramatic increases in 2008-9 for Heineken and Tiger family products. BSIC brands did not progress. In 2008, Heineken brand beersellers (N=98) sold ,on average, 35% more beer nightly than they did in 2006 (N=24). Sales in early 2009 are up an additional 6% to 28 litres nightly (N=29).

12. See e.g. “Heineken en promotiemeisjes in Cambodja – deel A,” R. Feilzer and F.P. van der Putten (p. 85-96) and F.P. van der Putten, “ – deel B” (p. 109-13), in: Bedrijfsgevallen, Eds. W Dubbink and H. van Luijk (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006). See reference to the letter by M. Berssenbrugge (Director Corporate Communication) of June 18, 2002 in "Just dying for a Heineken? A case study of Cambodian “beer promotion women”, corporate caution, recalcitrance or criminal neglect?," Ian Lubek, 2004 <<http://www.fairtradebeer.com/reportfiles/lubekheineken2004.rtf>>

13. 80/224 or 35.7% had received it in the next 6 months, while the remainder had training in the next 18 months or not at all (122 or 54.5%). For the period after BSIC’s foundation, (2007-9), beer sellers reported getting training from either the SBS or other in-house workplace programs 25.4% of the time (N=189). See also “Antiretrovirals for employees of large companies in Cambodia,” T. van Merode, B.C. Dy, S. Kros, and I. Lubek, 23 September, 2006, The Lancet 368, p. 1065 <<http://www.fairtradebeer.com/reportfiles/Lancetletterpublished23092006.pdf>>

14. A Khmer version of the Code of Conduct for distribution to beer-sellers appeared 2 years later, in 2008, and was posted on several non-BSIC web-sites, but as of March, 2009, the official BSIC website (www.bsic.com.kh) still only has the English version.

15. “Labor Code for Kingdom of Cambodia”, 13 March 1997 <http://www.cdpcambodia.org/labor_law.asp>

16. “Labor Code for Kingdom of Cambodia” (13 March 1997) <http://www.cdpcambodia.org/labor_law.asp>

17. “OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises” <http://www.oecd.org/departement/0,3355,en_2649_34889_1_1_1_1_1,00.html>

For procedures on how Dutch citizens or groups can question Dutch-based corporation's business practices abroad through the OECD Contact Panel, see: <http://www.oesorichtlijnen.nl/english/ncp-national-contact-point/>

18. For a reported US\$20,000. That amount could pay for HAAART for 200 beer sellers for 1 year. In Cambodia, where civil servants and doctors may earn \$25-40 monthly, and beer sellers \$70.00 monthly, \$20,000 would run the NGO SiRCHESEI for half a year: with outreach health education for 8000 people, health and safety workshops for beer-sellers 100-150 beer sellers and other vulnerable groups (unpaid for by the industry), a school program for 25 former beer sellers training for alternate career paths in the Hotel industry, annual community health monitoring, and payroll for a staff of 9 Cambodians and 20 outreach educators.

19. "Update on beer promoters in Cambodia - press information," 5 June 2008
<[http://www.bsic.com.kh/documents/BSIC_press_update_5th_June_2008\(Audit\).pdf](http://www.bsic.com.kh/documents/BSIC_press_update_5th_June_2008(Audit).pdf)>

20. The survey reported "that over 38% of beer promoters from all four companies experience sexual harassment on a regular basis, and over 70% have experienced customers attempting to force them to drink alcohol". However, SiRCHESEI found that 91% of beer sellers in 2008 were still drinking with customers regularly— about 7.4% of BSIC sellers had abstained from drinking on two consecutive nights. CAS found that "fewer than 7% of respondents from the four companies reported being unhappy with their current working conditions". Compare this with a SiRCHESEI question (a6.5, N=183) asking: Please evaluate your current job. BSIC sellers replied: 44% (good to excellent) and 46% (bad to extremely bad) with 10% (it's just a job).. Non-BSIC sellers responded 31% favorably, 56% unfavorably, and 13% neutral. When we asked (E41a, N=248) whether they enjoyed working as an Entertainment worker (e.g., beer promoter) only 34% of the overall sample (2004-2009) said yes; there was no variation over time or across BSIC vs non-BSIC beer sellers— e.g., in 2007-9, BSIC workers agreed 35% of the time. When we asked about whether this job gave them good self-esteem and good self-image, 92% overall said "NO"; Non-BSIC women (N=98) answered "no" 95% of the time, while BSIC women (N=157) answered 90.5% "NO".. A Human Resource manager might wish to probe further this pattern of results. SiRCHESEI's data generally have shown over the years that most of the women want to leave the job, have ideas for other jobs (but lack qualifications such as Khmer literacy) and are still ashamed to tell family that they work as a beer seller.

21. According to a Heineken spokeswoman. She was quoted saying that this amount was "conforming to market forces" and adding "it is paramount to consider the context of the local culture and history of the country. The situation at the spot is not comparable in any way with our western concepts of going out and the bar-restaurant sector." In: "Biermeisjes bezorgen Heineken hoofdpijn," Financieele Telegraaf (p. 27) 10 mei 2008
<http://www.telegraaf.nl/dft/bedrijven/heineken/889782/Biermeisjes_bezorgen_Heineken_hoofdpijn.html>

22. The BSIC brands, including Heineken and its partners, paid \$71.88 on average during 2007-2009, while the non-BSIC competitors were paid significantly more at \$83.56, replicating a similar disparity during the period 2004-6 when commissioned non-BSIC sellers earned about \$10 more monthly than salaried (later BSIC) Heineken, Tiger and Angkor sellers. Overall, for the entire period of 2004-2009, the commission-paid non-BSIC

“other brands” -including Hollandia, Bavaria, Corona, Singha, San Miguel- paid the best (\$77.25) with BSIC’s Carlsberg brands (primarily Angkor) averaging lowest at \$54.75; next were BSIC’s Heineken (\$70.38) and non-BSIC AB-INBEV (\$72.36).

23. “A Social Psychological, Grassroots Empowerment Pilot Project for “Beer Girls” (Female Indirect Sex Workers) in Cambodia,” McCourt, M. (2002), University of Guelph CA. <<http://www.fairtradebeer.com/reportfiles/mccourt2002.rtf>>

24. Heineken’s Sietze Montijn of Corporate Affairs, September 3, 2002, clarified the position about not coming immediately to Cambodia: “ ..if Heineken announces policies we first want to make sure that we can implement these policies. That is a very important reason why we first have to wait and evaluate the results of the [Central African] pilot .” Just dying for a Heineken? A case study of Cambodian “beer promotion women”, corporate caution, recalcitrance or criminal neglect?," Ian Lubek (2004), <http://www.fairtradebeer.com/reportfiles/lubekheineken2004.rtf>. For Heineken’s evaluation of their African program, see: “HAART for the HIV-infected employees of large companies in Africa,” S. van der Borgh, T. F. Rinke de Wit, V. Janssens, M. F. Schim van der Loeff, H. Rijckborst, J. M. A. Lange (2006), 5 August, 2006, The Lancet 368, pp. 547-550 <<http://www.fairtradebeer.com/reportfiles/PIIS0140673606691654.pdf>>

25. “Combining Alcohol and HIV/AIDS risks in Cambodia Presentation by Lubek, I., et al (University of Guelph) given at Heineken Headquarters, Amsterdam, 29 Sept 2006 <<http://www.fairtradebeer.com/presentations/Heineken2006.exe>>. Similar presentations were also made the same week to INVEV and Carlsberg.

26. When questioned at the Heineken AGM meeting in 2007 by VBDO representatives using an independent report from SOMO, an “internal study” was promised by the CEO for one year later. Conditions did not improve during 2007, and VBDO presented additional questions to the AGM in April, 2008. The CEO suggested that the internal audit had shown progress. According to several press reports, he called into question data gathered by SiRCHESI and circulated to major brewers, the press, and himself. It is reported that a study by CARE International was done in 2007 but never released to the public, and in 2008 a “BSIC AUDIT” study was done by CAS (discussed above)

27. “Annual Report 2008,” Heineken N.V., 20 March 2008 (p. 19) <http://www.annualreport.heineken.com/downloads/Heineken_Annual_Report_08.pdf>

28. Hans Wesseling, a Heineken spokesperson on social responsibility , interviewed by: J. Bouma (2003) Promotiemeisjes/Biertje? [Promotion girls/anyone for a beer?] Trouw, 23 May, p.3. [English translation at www.fairtradebeer.com],

29. Why are Cambodian beer sellers still receiving such a low salary when they bring such high sales to the company and shareholders? In nearby Singapore, the same brands’ beer sellers earn more in two days than their Cambodian colleagues do in 1 month, and in much safer working conditions.

30. “Cambodia Fears troubles brewing with “beer girls,” A. Schiffrin, Los Angeles Times, Business Section, Aug. 27, 1998. <<http://articles.latimes.com/1998/aug/27/business/fi->

[16921](#)>. Mentions both Heineken and Cambodia Breweries Ltd.

31. An article from Cambodge Soir, Vol. 1, #37, 18-25.06.2008 , translated into English and posted at: <http://cambodiamirror.wordpress.com/2008/06/20/thursday-1962008-situation-of-women-promoting-beer-does-not-improve/> first explains how 8 beer sellers challenged Heineken's local brewery, Cambodia Breweries Ltd. to raise salaries from \$50 for beginners, and \$70 for those with 6 years experience to \$100. One of the women, Sophea, explained she cannot support her son's study from her salary. She indicated "Because the salary is not enough, some even sell sexual services. Some restaurants have rooms for having sex. I have seen many of my colleagues who agreed to do this because of the money." And another beer seller, Ms. Bunny, deputy director of the Men's and Women's Network for Development in Cambodia working with 300 beer sellers "criticized the working conditions related to companies that are members of BSIC, and she proposed that those companies should provide a minimum salary of US\$80 to the beer promoting women. She explained, 'I do not want to work for those companies, because I want to get a salary of over US\$50 per month.' She, like more than 200 women of her association, gets commissions from the restaurants where she works. The commission she gets is US\$8 per box. She said, 'So I earn more than US\$100 per month.' "Ms. Bunny explained, 'Doing this job, we have to face a situation of getting tired, of gang-rapes [where a group of men rape one woman], and just simple sexual rape.' Four among ten members of her organization had been gang-raped, especially those in Phnom Penh. She went on to say, 'When a woman negotiates with a guest and agrees to go with that that guest, she often faces two to three more men, and the woman can do nothing against it.' Each of the beer promoting women has at least once sold sexual services for US\$10 or US\$20. She admitted, 'For me, I have sold sex three times, because I needed money.' Those who seek more income by selling sexual services are mostly women abandoned by their husbands, who have children as their special burden; but other women agreed to have sex with guests because they had been threatened with weapons."

32.

One set of WHO Guidelines from 2000 was promoted by the industry sponsored ICAP organization as "the World Health Organization (WHO) in its Guide to Mental Health in Primary Care, where recommendations are based on three levels of risk: "responsible," "hazardous" and "harmful". The "responsible," or "low", level of risk for ... women ... are lowered to 2 units per day and 14 per week. (A unit is defined as the equivalent of 8g of ethanol.) The "hazardous" level of consumption is defined by an increasing risk of problems, such as raised blood pressure, stroke, and liver cirrhosis, and is set at ... 2-5 units per day and 15-35 per week for women. The "harmful" level, where "sustained drinking at this level is likely to cause physical, mental, and social problems," is... over 5 units per day and over 35 units per week for women. ", text by the International Center For Alcohol Policies (ICAP) in International Drinking Guidelines Reports 14
<<http://www.icap.org/Publication/ICAPReports/tabid/147/Default.aspx>>. See also : "The alcohol, smoking and substance screening involvement screening test (ASSIST): In guidelines for use in primary care (World Health Organization, September, 2003)
<http://www.who.int/entity/substance_abuse/activities/en/Draft_The_ASSIST_Guidelines.pdf

33. Heineken has over 55 full -service country websites (www.heineken.com) including two sites for neighbouring Vietnam (but not Cambodia). A full-service national website for Cambodians to also access information about the beer company and related health issues, similar to the US, e.g., would be useful. . _____
<http://www.heineken.com/usa/cc/responsibly/default.aspx>

34. Access to the site is currently problematic. We asked 21 Khmer speaking persons to access the site for information on women's drinking in Khmer, using different internet browsers. Some could see no Khmer text or images, some only images, and some found limited Khmer information but connections to English information on women drinking 1-2 drinks daily. But since Cambodian women are about 2/3 the size of American women, it might be a more responsible suggestion to suggest they only drink no more than 2/3 of 1 glass of beer (the American limit) nightly? One person thought he saw the place where a contest for \$3888 could be entered, but all others reported not seeing this. The <http://www.bsic.com.kh> website is thus far only in English and requires updating. In future weeks, we will search for other company-sponsored Khmer websites about alcohol education.

35. "A Multi-method Assessment of SiRCHESI's Hotel Apprenticeship Program for Women Formerly Selling Beer in Cambodia," Pollock, G. (Unpublished Hon. BA thesis, 2008), University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

36. As Tiger Beer seller Sophea wrote to management at Cambodian Breweries Ltd., asking for a salary increase to \$100 monthly: "Our claim is absolutely justified. The quantity of our sales increased, and the price of beer increased too.... Now it {Tiger Beer} is sold for US\$2.90. " (Cambodge Soir, 18-25 June, 2008).
<<http://cambodiamirror.wordpress.com/2008/06/20/thursday-1962008-situation-of-women-promoting-beer-does-not-improve/>>

37. "Heineken's HIV/AIDS Policy - contribution of a private company," HEINEKEN COR P. COMMUNICATION ~ 02 92857455 NO. 023, by Heineken International, 18 April 2002 (at <http://fairtradebeer.com/reportfiles/heinekenaidspolicy2002.pdf>)

38. Although Heineken proactively developed the Selling Beer Safely Program in 2003 it has not been offered to every employee; of 224 Heineken family sellers in our sample (2004-2009), 31.2% had received no health training at the time of the interview. (better than the industry average of 43.3% with no health and safety training about being a beer seller). Interestingly, 22% of beersellers received SBS training in 2004, while the percentage has declined steadily; only 4.7% beersellers in 2008 had received SBS training from Heineken or Tiger. However, when asked whether they had received either the SBS or another in-house training program, BSIC beersellers did modestly better: 27.8% reported in-house training, while non-BSIC sellers reported 8.3% in-house training. Of 224 Heineken family beer sellers, 16 (7.1%) received this before they started, and a further 6 (2.7%) received it on the first day