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## Introduction from the President

Welcome to the 2015 edition of the European Fruit Juice Association (AIJN) Market Report. It is our goal to provide a comprehensive overview of our industry to European and national legislators, non-governmental organisations and fellow stakeholders in the food and drinks industry with this report, so wherever you are in the world, a very warm welcome to you.
As the newly-elected AIJN President, I would like to start off by thanking all of the national associations for the trust accorded to me in this challenging and turbulent time for the European Fruit Juice Industry.

For those of you who do not already know me, I am from the Netherlands and represent the Dutch FWS. I have enjoyed a long and successful international career with Nestle SA, before taking up the position of Managing Director of FrieslandCampina Riedel 2 years ago. I have a Masters in Business Administration, am married and have two children.
It has been a very busy and exciting year for the AIJN, most notably because of several major projects that our industry is involved in and because of the departure of our former President, Andrew Biles.

Andrew has been an integral part of the AIJN for over 10 years and his guidance and leadership on key issues and projects have been crucial in defining the path of the AIJN. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to thank Andrew for all the work he has put into the fruit juice industry association, and to wish him the best of luck and much success in his future endeavors.

We have been very active in terms of the major projects we have been working on, the AIJN Juice Marketing Campaign and the Fruit Juice CSR Platform. More information on both is provided within this report. Moreover, I would like to point out that AIJN is celebrating 25 years of its Code of Practice this year. The AIJN Code of Practice has been a crucial tool for the AIJN and has become the world-wide reference guide for authenticity and quality of fruit juices. More details and an interview with one of the COP experts of the first hour can be found in this edition of the AIJN Market Report.
2015 will also see the AIJN co-organising the third Juice Summit, which is now becoming the annual, global industry event. Due to the immense success and positive reviews from last year, we have decided to hold it in Antwerp once again. Together with its partners, IFU and SGF, the AIJN will assemble global suppliers, bottlers and customers in what has clearly become the "must-attend" conference for senior fruit juice executives across the globe. If you have not done so already, make sure to save the dates of 7 and 8 October in your calendars, and we'll look forward to seeing you in Antwerp. Please visit: www.juicesummit.org to register.
Finally, I would like to thank all of those who dedicate their time to our Board and to our Committees. It is only when you are a part of one of these that you really appreciate the workload and the time that goes into it. I would also like to extend a special thank you to the staff at the AIJN Secretariat, without whose help and effort we would not be able to function as successfully as we do.

Have a great summer, and I look forward to welcoming you in Antwerp at the 2015 JUICE SUMMIT.



Marjan Skotnicki-Hoogland, AIJN President

> The AIJN Code of Practice has been a crucial tool for the AlJN and has become the world-wide reference guide for authenticity and quality of fruit juices.


## EU Total Fruit Juice and Nectars

| EU: Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |  |  |
| Total |  | 11,118 | 10,819 | 10,469 | 10,028 | 9,702 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $-3.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Private label | 4,798 | 4,683 | 4,558 | 4,301 | 4,077 |  |  |
|  | Branded | 6,320 | 6,135 | 5,911 | 5,726 | 5,624 |  |  |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 7,191 | 7,024 | 6,786 | 6,478 | 6,215 | -4.1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Private label | 3,332 | 3,234 | 3,096 | 2,899 | 2,694 | -7.1\% |
| Branded | 3,859 | 3,790 | 3,691 | 3,579 | 3,521 | -1.6\% |
| Chilled | 1,323 | 1,360 | 1,403 | 1,407 | 1,393 | -1.0\% |
| Ambient | 5,868 | 5,665 | 5,383 | 5,071 | 4,822 | -4.9\% |
| From concentrate | 5,585 | 5,300 | 4,995 | 4,647 | 4,367 | -6.0\% |
| Not from concentrate | 1,606 | 1,725 | 1,791 | 1,830 | 1,848 | 1.0\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 3,927 | 3,794 | 3,683 | 3,550 | 3,486 | $-1.8 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Private label | 1,466 | 1,449 | 1,463 | 1,402 | 1,383 | $-1.4 \%$ |
| Branded | 2,461 | 2,345 | 2,220 | 2,148 | 2,103 | $-2.1 \%$ |


| Largest EU FJN market by volume <br> consumption, 2014 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Country | Million <br> litres |
| Germany | 2,405 |
| France | 1,551 |
| United Kingdom | 1,192 |
| Spain | 968 |
| Poland | 699 |
| Others | 2,887 |
| Total | 9,702 |

## Largest EU FJN market by per

 capita consumption, 2014| Country | Population <br> (million) | Litres per <br> person |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Malta | 0.4 | 33.6 |
| Germany | 81.0 | 29.7 |
| Netherlands | 16.8 | 26.8 |
| Finland | 5.4 | 25.3 |
| Cyprus | 1.2 | 24.3 |

Largest FJN markets by volume consumption by region, 2014

| Region | Million <br> litres |
| :--- | ---: |
| North America | 9,480 |
| West Europe | 8,793 |
| Asia Pacific | 8,330 |
| East Europe | 4,794 |
| Latin America | 3,631 |
| Africa \& | 3,625 |
| Middle East | 38,653 |
| Total | 9,702 |
| EU 28 |  |

Largest FJN markets by per capita consumption by region, 2014

| Country | Population <br> (million) | Litres per <br> person |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| North America | 354.3 | 26.8 |
| West Europe | 416.8 | 21.1 |
| EU 28 | 507.5 | 19.1 |
| East Europe | 397.7 | 12.1 |
| Latin America | 617.4 | 5.9 |
| Africa \& | $1,362.6$ | 2.7 |
| Middle East | $4,041.1$ | 2.1 |
| Asia Pacific |  |  |

## 25 Years AIJN Code of Practice © ${ }^{\text {AIJ }}$

The first version of the European Fruit Juice Directive 75/726/ EEC which came into force in 1975 established some of the requirements that fruit juices and similar products had to meet. In article 13 of this Directive it was stated that the "analytical and microbiological characteristics of the products defined" had to be determined by the European Council on a proposal from the Commission, but this was never done.
In a later amendment of the Fruit Juice Directive, the provision in Article 13 was deleted and the European Fruit Juice Industry was left with the task of establishing the analytical parameters, as well as other requirements, that fruit juices produced and sold in the European Union had to fuffi. At the end of the 1980's, AlJN took on the challenge to provide the necessary parameters for industrially-processed fruit juices and a working group within its Technical Committee was set up which would eventually become the permanent Code of Practice Expert Group. The designated experts started their work by determining analytical characteristics for the major flavours, i.e. apple, grapefruit, orange and grape juice, and decided that the individual documents setting out the analytical characteristics of those juices would be called "Reference Guidelines". These guidelines were approved by the AIJN General Assembly on 3 May 1990 in Bruges and it was agreed to call the collection of these guidelines the "Code of Practice" (COP). Thus, the AJJN COP was officially born.
A wide range of factors can influence the composition of fruits, be it natural factors such as fruit variety, soil properties, weather, or factors like the extraction and processing techniques used to make a juice. Despite all the known, and sometimes unknown influences, the experience shows that a large number of parameters and values are subject to statistical laws. Consequently, it is possible to define with some degree of confidence the minimum or maximum values and/or ranges for several characteristics that are frequently found in a typical fruit juice. The Reference Guidelines therefore attempt to consolidate such minimum and maximum values and/or ranges which can then be used to evaluate juices with regards to quality, authenticity and identity
From the initial four Reference Guidelines, the Code of Practice has evolved substantially and today it comprises of twenty five individual Reference Guidelines for different fruit juices. The guidelines are divided into two parts. The first part is the A criteria which are parameters and values that characterize
the basic quality requirements which the industry considers as being mandatory for all fruit juices marketed in the EU. These parameters include degrees Brix, hygiene requirements (volatile acids, ethanol, patulin, etc.), environmental contaminants and compositional substances like L-ascorbic acid, volatile oil, and others. The B -criteria are parameters related to the identity and
 authenticity of the juice in question.
But the AIJN Code of Practice is not just about the Reference Guidelines for individual fruit juices. Much more has been accomplished in the last 25 years. The Code of Practice contains several guidance documents which respond to the needs of an evolving industry. Examples include: the 'Guide to
Good Hyoien offers guidance for food business operators to enable them to adhere to European hygiene regulations and to produce and market safe fruit and vegetable juice products; the 'Alicyclobacillus Best Practice Guideline', which identifies practices and measures for the reduction and control of Alicyclobacillus bacteria in fruit juices, juice concentrates, purées and nectars; the 'Microbiological Guidelines for Fruit and Vegetable Semi-Finished Products', specifically concerned with those organisms known to be capable of growing in fruit and vegetable juices, purées and concentrates that have a pH significantly less than 4.3; the 'Guideline for Vegetable Juices and Nectars' which offers definitions on different products, authorised treatments and ingredients as well as minimum juice content for vegetable nectars; the 'Standard Nutrient Values for Fruit Juices' guidance document that establishes nutrition tables for the mos common juices (orange, apple, pineapple, grape, grapefruit, tomato); as well as several other guidance documents. An important highlight of these 25 years of COP history was the reference made by the European Commission in the 2009 revision of the Fruit Juice Directive which stated that: "The AIJN Code of Practice establishes quality factors for fruit juice from concentrate and is internationally used as a reference standard for self-regulation in the fruit juice industry.
The continuous development and improvement of the AJJN Code of Practice is the result of the efforts and dedication of a highly qualified group of international professionals who constitute the Code of Practice Expert Group. They have strong expertise and knowledge about processed fruit and come from both the processing and bottling industries, as well as from universities, technical institutes, processing equipment suppliers, and commercial laboratories.
To this day, we still rely on the immense knowledge of some of the experts who joined the group in the early stages. This therefore presents us with a great opportunity to sincerely thank all of the experts who have contributed to the AIJN Code of Practice until now. Their expertise, professionalism and dedication have left a permanent imprint on the fruit juice industry.
Commision Directive 2009/006/EC of 14 August 2009 amending Council
Directive $2001 / 112 / E C$ relating to fruit tices and certain simiar products Directive $2001 / 11212$ ECC Celating tef fruit juices and certain similar products
intended for human consumption

## Meet the Expert

Dr. Karl Neuhäuser, Director Quality and Sustainability, Eckes-Granini Group GmbH

## For how

## group?

My official start was as a member of the so called "pineapple juice expert group", beginning its work in 1992. Just before, in 1990, four reference guidelines (orange, grapefruit, apple and grape) were finished and published. Further members of this "pineapple juice expert group" were Stefano Gherardi (ttaly), Martin Greave (Netherlands), B. Harris (UK) and George Mangeot (France).
But unofficially - as a co-worker of Alfred Wiesenberger, one of the founding fathers of the CoP - I participated in the CoP-work from the early beginning ( $\sim 1988$ ).

## What were the expectations you had when you

 became an expert in the group? Did these
## expectations come true?

With the publication of the first four fruits in 1990 the importance of the AIJN-CoP could already be underlined: a document representing the European custom of trade. My expectation was that this real European approach replaces the still existing national approaches (e.g. RSK in Germany, AFNOR in France or similar standards in the Netherlands) and that a globallyacceptable document could be created. Both expectations came true. Great appreciation to the long-time chairman of the CoPEG: Martin Greave.

I'm convinced that the COP sets the basis for our industry's target to get rid of adulteration, unfair competition and negative publicity.

## Comparing the work the group was doing at the

 time you entered with what is currently being done what would you say have been the main changes, if any, over the years?Today the CoP work is much more complex and faster. The maintenance of existing and the development of new Reference Guidelines is not the only focus. Meanwhile the group is dealing with all technical and analytical issues which are relevant for quality and authenticity or can hurt our industry (contaminants, GMOs ....). And, we have to consider that analytical methods have improved a lot.

## In your opinion, what have been the mai

 achievements of the AIJN COP over these 25 years?The AIJN COP is covering the major part of our industry and is accepted nearly all over the world. It is an up-to-date and "living" document with current new knowledge integrated. The COP is the guidance standard (besides legislation) for industrial selfcontrol within EQCS (bottlers) and SGF-IRMA (raw materials),

## And the main challenges?

Clearness and transparency has to remain a high priority. AIJN has to pay attention that it does not support any dilution of quality. If Mother Nature comes to strange parameters - which does happen - it has to be clearly indicated as a seasonal and/or regional exception. Here, the COP has defined procedures which have to be kept.

Would you agree the AIJN COP has contributed to a more transparent, responsible and competitive industry?
convinced that the COP sets the basis for our industry's target o get rid of adulteration, unfair competition and negative publicity. and in mind what happened in the ' 80 s and '90s and looking to the statistics of EQCS, one can see the improvement.
your view, what is the future for the AIJN COP? m quite sure that the AJJN is continuing the COP work in a professional way with highly experienced and committed experts. By doing this, the high value for our industry will remain.


## AIJN Juice Marketing Campaign

Increasingly, juices are finding themselves under attack in the media and this is having an impact on sales. In order to re-balance these attacks, the industry asked the AIJN to develop a pan-European marketing programme to support the industry.

The primary goal of the marketing campaign is to protect and celebrate $100 \%$ fruit juice. There is no simple solution to resolve the problems we are facing, but it is crucial that we start proactively supporting fruit juice and its benefits as soon as possible.

> In order to engage the media and provide credible facts, we need the help of scientists and nutritionists.

Ultimately, our objective is to change consumer perceptions and behaviours so that they recognise the benefits of drinking fruit juice and build juice into their daily routines. However, before we can engage these consumers directly, we know that we have to get the media on our side first.

The media are currently only sharing one side of the argument, and we therefore urgently need to re-balance the conversation and proactively provide them with positive news about juice. Our messaging needs to be supported with credible facts, which will help the media present a more favourable view of juices.


In order to engage the media and provide credible facts, we need the help of scientists and nutritionists - many of whom already support juice, but who have not been fairly represented in the media to date. Using independent, renowned scientists and nutritionists will give the industry the credibility it needs to start talking to the media, who will then engage consumers.

Our core message is that $100 \%$ fruit juice is fruit, juiced. It contains nutrients which can contribute to your health and wellbeing, and is a tasty and convenient way to get an additional serving of fruit as part of a healthy lifestyle. Moreover, the European fruit juice sector is committed to maintaining high standards of quality and sustainability and has adopted solid production practices to ensure juice products are safe to consume.

To help deliver this campaign, there will be materials to backup the message house including a glossary, a nutrient chart for $100 \%$ fruit juices, a set of FAQ's/Q \& A's, which will address common questions on fruit juice issues, as well as fact sheets on specific topics. A campaign website is also planned, which will contain all the campaign toolbox materials.

It is important to remember that the industry is facing many of the same issues across Europe. This means that we should work together to face this challenge. The AIJN will equip each national association with tools and capabilities to run the campaign locally, including messaging, marketing materials and credible, scientific back-up that can be used as a basis for activation in each country. With these central materials, local associations will be equipped to activate a plan that works in their respective markets.

The campaign's success significantly depends on active engagement from each national association. We are conscious of the fact that some national associations are already doing a lot of work in order to promote the benefits of fruit juice. This is why we want to ensure that all work on the PR Campaign will complement the work which has already been carried out by national associations. It is critical that national associations are involved to commit, support, deliver, and in the long-term, maintain the programme.

> It is important to remember that the industry is facing many of the same issues across Europe.

Overall, the aim of this campaign is to change people's behaviour regarding fruit juice. We want consumers to see fruit juice as a key part of a healthy diet and really understand the benefits which it brings. By using the credible science we have, we hope to accelerate positive media coverage and ultimately, to create positive foundations which enable growth for the entire European fruit juice industry.

# The CSR Path of the Fruit Juice Industry 

In today's competitive markets, consumers are becoming more and more aware of how their purchases affect social, economic and environmental conditions of millions of people involved in the production of goods they buy, and so is the fruit juice industry. As the rules of doing business are changing, companies are facing increasing expectations from NGOs, media, governments, and others to take responsibility for the impact of their business operations. European fruit juice producers have proactively acknowledged this responsibility. There are a number of AIJN initiatives that prove this commitment.

The main one is the development of the Fruit Juice CSR Platform (www.juicecsr.eu), initially supported and co-funded by the European Commission. This multi-stakeholder Platform aims to promote:

- A common understanding and agreement on CSR in the fruit juice industry, including areas to collaborate on and ways to track progress
■ Enhanced performance on addressing social, environmental and economic concerns, creating shared value throughout the supply chain
- Greater visibility of CSR and sustainability efforts in the fruit juice sector


## Fruit Juice CSR Principles



Aim for food security, health and nutrition
Be environmentally responsible - protect and enhance the environment


Ensure economic viability and share value


Respect human rights, create acceptable working conditions and help communities to thrive

Encourage good governance and accountability

Promote access and transfer of knowledge, skills and technology

CSR Principles of the CSR Sector Roadmap and the former SGF/ IRMA Code of Conduct. This AIJN Code is founded on the basis of general principles contained in the International Bill of Human Rights, Fundamental ILO Conventions, relevant United Nations Conventions and Guidelines, SAI Farm Sustainability Assessment

As a concrete output of its first phase of operation, the Fruit Juice CSR Platform developed a Sector CSR Roadmap providing the framework upon which the Platform will base all its activities and programmes going forward. This Roadmap presents a set of 6 CSR principles, based on the UN Global Compact Food and Agriculture Business Principles (FABs), and forms the foundation for continued collaboration on strategic CSR in the fruit juice sector. It also provides an overview of existing tools and initiatives that are relevant for and applicable to the fruit juice sector and can be used (individually or in collaboration) as instruments for demonstrating commitment to the CSR principles. The Roadmap is a living document, which will be updated regularly as new developments and insights require.

Furthermore, AIJN recently revised and approved a new Code of Business Conduct which is based on both the Six Fruit Juice
 and other relevant internationally-recognised standards. Its purpose is to ensure that all players in the fruit juice value chain operate in accordance with internationally-recognised minimum standards on human rights, labour and environment. The Code applies to all companies involved in the production of fruit juices, from producers of raw materials to producers of consumer goods.

All these initiatives come in addition to national laws on standard labour conditions that exist in every supplying and producing country, and which are reinforced by collective agreements and voluntary practices adopted by individual companies. They seek additional benefits for workers, their families and the community at large. AlJN fully supports these actions and is devoted to working towards higher transparency and sector-wide commitments in this area.


## (A) AStiß

Population: $\mathbf{8 . 5}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 242 | 233 | 229 | 213 | 197 | $-7.6 \%$ |

Fruit juice ( $100 \%$ juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 160 | 155 | 153 | 144 | 132 | -8.4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 87 | 85 | 85 | 84 | 76 | -10.1\% |
|  | Private label | 73 | 70 | 68 | 60 | 57 | -6.1\% |
| Ambient |  | 143 | 139 | 136 | 128 | 114 | -11.6\% |
|  | Branded | 77 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 65 | -12.9\% |
|  | Private label | 66 | 63 | 61 | 54 | 49 | -9.8\% |
| From concentrate |  | 140 | 136 | 133 | 126 | 111 | -11.8\% |
|  | Branded | 74 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 62 | -13.3\% |
|  | Private label | 66 | 63 | 61 | 54 | 49 | -9.8\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -0.8\% |
|  | Branded | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -0.8\% |
| Chilled |  | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 16.8\% |
|  | Branded | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 11.5\% |
|  | Private label | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 24.4\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 16.8\% |
|  | Branded | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 11.5\% |
|  | Private label | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 24.4\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 38.1\% |
|  | Branded | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -14.8\% |
|  | Private label | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.0\% |

## Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 83 | 78 | 76 | 68 | 64 | -5.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 49 | 46 | 45 | 42 | 39 | -6.3\% |
|  | Private label | 33 | 32 | 31 | 26 | 25 | -5.0\% |
| Ambient |  | 83 | 78 | 76 | 68 | 64 | -5.8\% |
|  | Branded | 49 | 46 | 45 | 42 | 39 | -6.3\% |
|  | Private label | 33 | 32 | 31 | 26 | 25 | -5.0\% |
| From concentrate |  | 83 | 78 | 76 | 68 | 64 | -5.8\% |
|  | Branded | 49 | 46 | 45 | 42 | 39 | -6.3\% |
|  | Private label | 33 | 32 | 31 | 26 | 25 | -5.0\% |

## NOBIUIUn <br> Population: 11.2 million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 222 | 222 | 213 | 213 | 210 | $-1.1 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 186 | 186 | 177 | 177 | 174 | -1.4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 75 | 74 | 68 | 68 | 66 | -2.1\% |
|  | Private label | 111 | 112 | 110 | 109 | 108 | -1.0\% |
| Ambient |  | 170 | 169 | 160 | 158 | 154 | -3.0\% |
|  | Branded | 64 | 61 | 55 | 54 | 51 | -6.1\% |
|  | Private label | 106 | 108 | 105 | 104 | 103 | -1.4\% |
| From concentrate |  | 170 | 169 | 160 | 158 | 153 | -3.0\% |
|  | Branded | 64 | 61 | 55 | 54 | 51 | -6.1\% |
|  | Private label | 106 | 108 | 105 | 104 | 103 | -1.4\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -14.7\% |
|  | Branded | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -14.7\% |
| Chilled |  | 16 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 12.5\% |
|  | Branded | 12 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 13.7\% |
|  | Private label | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9.3\% |
| From concentrate |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0\% |
|  | Branded | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 16 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 12.7\% |
|  | Branded | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 13.9\% |
|  | Private label | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9.3\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 40.0\% |
|  | Branded | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 25.0\% |
|  | Private label | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 100.0\% |

## Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 0.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 2.2\% |
|  | Private label | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | -2.3\% |
| Ambient |  | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 0.0\% |
|  | Branded | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 1.4\% |
|  | Private label | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | -2.3\% |
| From concentrate |  | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 0.0\% |
|  | Branded | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 1.4\% |
|  | Private label | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | -2.3\% |
| Chilled |  | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 28.6\% |
|  | Branded | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 28.6\% |
| From concentrate |  | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 28.6\% |
|  | Branded | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 28.6\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 12.5\% |
|  | Branded | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 12.5\% |

# MFrance <br> Population: $\mathbf{6 6 . 2}$ million 

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 1,693 | 1,713 | 1,681 | 1,621 | 1,551 | $-4.3 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 1,298 | 1,328 | 1,314 | 1,281 | 1,240 | -3.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 577 | 592 | 583 | 586 | 581 | -0.7\% |
|  | Private label | 721 | 736 | 731 | 695 | 658 | -5.3\% |
| Ambient |  | 1,164 | 1,181 | 1,152 | 1,111 | 1,062 | -4.4\% |
|  | Branded | 480 | 490 | 471 | 468 | 456 | -2.4\% |
|  | Private label | 685 | 691 | 682 | 643 | 606 | -5.8\% |
| From concentrate |  | 603 | 573 | 544 | 508 | 472 | -7.2\% |
|  | Branded | 187 | 176 | 160 | 151 | 145 | -4.2\% |
|  | Private label | 417 | 397 | 385 | 357 | 327 | -8.4\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 561 | 608 | 608 | 602 | 590 | -2.1\% |
|  | Branded | 293 | 314 | 311 | 317 | 312 | -1.6\% |
|  | Private label | 268 | 294 | 297 | 286 | 278 | -2.6\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | -58.3\% |
|  | Branded | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | -58.3\% |
| Chilled |  | 134 | 147 | 162 | 170 | 178 | 4.6\% |
|  | Branded | 97 | 102 | 112 | 118 | 125 | 5.9\% |
|  | Private label | 37 | 45 | 49 | 52 | 53 | 1.6\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 134 | 147 | 162 | 170 | 178 | 4.6\% |
|  | Branded | 97 | 102 | 112 | 118 | 125 | 5.9\% |
|  | Private label | 37 | 45 | 49 | 52 | 53 | 1.6\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | -2.1\% |
|  | Branded | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | -19.6\% |
|  | Private label | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 16.4\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 395 | 385 | 367 | 340 | 311 | -8.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branded | 107 | 106 | 99 | 96 | 94 | -1.9\% |
| Private label | 288 | 279 | 268 | 244 | 217 | -11.2\% |
| Ambient | 376 | 367 | 346 | 317 | 288 | -9.0\% |
| Branded | 89 | 90 | 80 | 75 | 73 | -1.9\% |
| Private label | 287 | 277 | 267 | 242 | 215 | -11.3\% |
| From concentrate | 376 | 367 | 346 | 317 | 288 | -9.0\% |
| Branded | 89 | 90 | 80 | 75 | 73 | -1.9\% |
| Private label | 287 | 277 | 267 | 242 | 215 | -11.3\% |
| of which are smoothies | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1.4\% |
| Branded | 1 | 0.4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -22.0\% |
| Private label | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 16.9\% |
| Chilled | 19 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 22 | -2.1\% |
| Branded | 18 | 17 | 19 | 21 | 21 | -1.8\% |
| Private label | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | -5.8\% |
| From concentrate | 19 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 22 | -2.1\% |
| Branded | 18 | 17 | 19 | 21 | 21 | -1.8\% |
| Private label | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | -5.8\% |
| Not from concentrate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Branded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| of which are smoothies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Branded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |

## 刁๑คnの <br> Population: $\mathbf{8 1 . 0}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 2,810 | 2,733 | 2,607 | 2,486 | 2,405 | $-3.3 \%$ |

Fruit juice ( $100 \%$ juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 1,915 | 1,900 | 1,824 | 1,747 | 1,669 | $-4.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 978 | 964 | 935 | 910 | 896 | $-1.5 \%$ |
| Private label | 937 | 935 | 889 | 838 | 772 | $-7.8 \%$ |
| Ambient | 1,858 | 1,844 | 1,757 | 1,666 | 1,573 | $-5.6 \%$ |
|  | 928 | 915 | 874 | 835 | 810 | $-3.0 \%$ |
| Branded | 930 | 929 | 883 | 831 | 763 | $-8.1 \%$ |
| Private label | 1,643 | 1,622 | 1,533 | 1,442 | 1,346 | $-6.6 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 893 | 873 | 824 | 785 | 761 | $-2.9 \%$ |
| Branded | 750 | 748 | 709 | 657 | 585 | $-11.1 \%$ |
| Private label | 215 | 222 | 224 | 224 | 227 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 35 | 41 | 50 | 50 | 48 | $-3.9 \%$ |
| Branded | 181 | 180 | 174 | 174 | 179 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Private label | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| of which are smoothies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Branded | 57 | 56 | 67 | 81 | 95 | $17.4 \%$ |
| Chilled | 50 | 49 | 61 | 75 | 86 | $15.9 \%$ |
|  | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 9 | $34.9 \%$ |
| Branded | 34 | 33 | 39 | 42 | 44 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Private label | 34 | 33 | 39 | 42 | 44 | $5.4 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 23 | 23 | 28 | 39 | 51 | $30.2 \%$ |
| Branded | 17 | 16 | 21 | 33 | 42 | $29.3 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 9 | $34.9 \%$ |
| Branded | 70 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 17 | $35.8 \%$ |
| Private label | 4 | 3 | 6 | 8 | $36.9 \%$ |  |
| Pranded | 7 | 6 | 7 | 9 | $34.9 \%$ |  |
| Private label |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |

## Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 895 | 833 | 783 | 739 | 737 | -0.3\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branded | 499 | 487 | 448 | 422 | 400 | -5.1\% |
| Private label | 396 | 346 | 336 | 317 | 337 | 6.1\% |
| Ambient | 889 | 828 | 778 | 734 | 736 | 0.2\% |
| Branded | 493 | 482 | 442 | 417 | 399 | -4.3\% |
| Private label | 396 | 346 | 336 | 317 | 337 | 6.1\% |
| From concentrate | 889 | 828 | 778 | 734 | 735 | 0.2\% |
| Branded | 493 | 482 | 442 | 416 | 399 | -4.3\% |
| Private label | 396 | 346 | 336 | 317 | 337 | 6.1\% |
| Not from concentrate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Branded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Chilled | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | -86.4\% |
| Branded | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | -86.4\% |
| From concentrate | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | -86.4\% |
| Branded | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | -86.4\% |
| of which are smoothies | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | -88.4\% |
| Branded | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | -88.4\% |

Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | $\%$ change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 807 | 808 | 774 | 726 | 690 | $-5.0 \%$ |

## Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 172 | 165 | 155 | 141 | 133 | -5.9\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 118 | 112 | 102 | 90 | 84 | -7.1\% |
|  | Private label | 54 | 53 | 52 | 51 | 49 | -3.8\% |
| Ambient |  | 154 | 148 | 139 | 128 | 121 | -5.6\% |
|  | Branded | 106 | 102 | 93 | 83 | 78 | -6.6\% |
|  | Private label | 48 | 46 | 45 | 45 | 43 | -3.9\% |
| From concentrate |  | 154 | 148 | 139 | 127 | 119 | -6.0\% |
|  | Branded | 106 | 102 | 93 | 82 | 76 | -7.2\% |
|  | Private label | 48 | 46 | 45 | 45 | 43 | -3.9\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 52.9\% |
|  | Branded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 52.9\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -37.5\% |
|  | Branded | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -37.5\% |
| Chilled |  | 18 | 17 | 16 | 13 | 12 | -8.4\% |
|  | Branded | 11 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 6 | -13.0\% |
|  | Private label | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | -3.0\% |
| From concentrate |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | -23.1\% |
|  | Branded | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | -23.1\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 17 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 10 | -4.1\% |
|  | Branded | 10 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 4 | -5.8\% |
|  | Private label | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | -3.0\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -24.8\% |
|  | Branded | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -24.8\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 635 | 643 | 620 | 584 | 557 | -4.7\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 474 | 448 | 407 | 373 | 351 | -5.8\% |
|  | Private label | 161 | 195 | 213 | 212 | 206 | -2.8\% |
| Ambient |  | 635 | 643 | 620 | 584 | 557 | -4.7\% |
|  | Branded | 474 | 448 | 407 | 373 | 351 | -5.8\% |
|  | Private label | 161 | 195 | 213 | 212 | 206 | -2.8\% |
| From concentrate |  | 635 | 643 | 620 | 584 | 557 | -4.7\% |
|  | Branded | 474 | 448 | 407 | 373 | 351 | -5.8\% |
|  | Private label | 161 | 195 | 213 | 212 | 206 | -2.8\% |

## Netherlands <br> Population: $\mathbf{1 6 . 8}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 466 | 474 | 490 | 468 | 450 | $-3.7 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)


## Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 183 | 190 | 200 | 195 | 190 | -3.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 84 | 89 | 92 | 88 | 80 | -8.8\% |
|  | Private label | 99 | 101 | 108 | 108 | 110 | 1.7\% |
| Ambient |  | 136 | 142 | 153 | 149 | 146 | -1.6\% |
|  | Branded | 49 | 52 | 57 | 53 | 49 | -7.4\% |
|  | Private label | 87 | 90 | 96 | 95 | 97 | 1.6\% |
| From concentrate |  | 136 | 142 | 153 | 149 | 146 | -1.6\% |
|  | Branded | 49 | 52 | 57 | 53 | 49 | -7.4\% |
|  | Private label | 87 | 90 | 96 | 95 | 97 | 1.6\% |
| Chilled |  | 47 | 48 | 47 | 47 | 43 | -7.4\% |
|  | Branded | 36 | 36 | 35 | 34 | 31 | -11.0\% |
|  | Private label | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 2.4\% |
| From concentrate |  | 47 | 48 | 47 | 47 | 43 | -7.4\% |
|  | Branded | 36 | 36 | 35 | 34 | 31 | -11.0\% |
|  | Private label | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 2.4\% |

## Nonono

Population: $\mathbf{3 8 . 1}$ million

Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 810 | 723 | 695 | 673 | 699 | $3.8 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 504 | 462 | 449 | 438 | 456 | 4.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 434 | 400 | 391 | 382 | 396 | 3.8\% |
|  | Private label | 70 | 62 | 58 | 57 | 60 | 5.8\% |
| Ambient |  | 457 | 409 | 392 | 378 | 392 | 3.8\% |
|  | Branded | 391 | 351 | 338 | 326 | 338 | 3.7\% |
|  | Private label | 66 | 58 | 54 | 52 | 54 | 3.8\% |
| From concentrate |  | 453 | 405 | 383 | 365 | 371 | 1.8\% |
|  | Branded | 387 | 347 | 329 | 314 | 320 | 2.0\% |
|  | Private label | 66 | 58 | 54 | 51 | 51 | 1.0\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 4 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 21 | 55.1\% |
|  | Branded | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 18 | 50.0\% |
|  | Private label | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 93.8\% |
| Chilled |  | 47 | 53 | 58 | 60 | 64 | 5.8\% |
|  | Branded | 43 | 49 | 54 | 56 | 58 | 3.9\% |
|  | Private label | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 29.5\% |
| From concentrate |  | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | -2.1\% |
|  | Branded | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | -2.1\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 38 | 44 | 48 | 51 | 55 | 7.3\% |
|  | Branded | 34 | 40 | 44 | 46 | 49 | 5.2\% |
|  | Private label | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 29.5\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5.3\% |
|  | Branded | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5.3\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 306 | 261 | 246 | 235 | 243 | 3.4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 202 | 160 | 148 | 142 | 147 | 3.5\% |
|  | Private label | 104 | 101 | 98 | 93 | 96 | 3.2\% |
| Ambient |  | 303 | 258 | 244 | 234 | 243 | 3.9\% |
|  | Branded | 199 | 157 | 146 | 141 | 147 | 4.3\% |
|  | Private label | 104 | 101 | 98 | 93 | 96 | 3.2\% |
| From concentrate |  | 303 | 258 | 244 | 234 | 243 | 3.9\% |
|  | Branded | 199 | 157 | 146 | 141 | 147 | 4.3\% |
|  | Private label | 104 | 101 | 98 | 93 | 96 | 3.2\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Branded | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0\% |
| Chilled |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -100.0\% |
|  | Branded | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -100.0\% |
| From concentrate |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -100.0\% |
|  | Branded | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -100.0\% |

## (1) Spain

Population: $\mathbf{4 6 . 5}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 1,097 | 1,068 | 1,046 | 985 | 968 | $-1.8 \%$ |

## Fruit juice ( $100 \%$ juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 512 | 481 | 444 | 394 | 376 | -4.7\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branded | 282 | 256 | 233 | 216 | 221 | 2.2\% |
| Private label | 229 | 225 | 211 | 178 | 155 | -13.1\% |
| Ambient | 456 | 435 | 398 | 350 | 333 | -4.9\% |
| Branded | 254 | 237 | 213 | 197 | 201 | 2.3\% |
| Private label | 203 | 199 | 185 | 153 | 132 | -14.1\% |
| From concentrate | 393 | 363 | 323 | 273 | 253 | -7.3\% |
| Branded | 226 | 203 | 179 | 162 | 161 | -0.4\% |
| Private label | 167 | 160 | 144 | 111 | 91 | -17.5\% |
| Not from concentrate | 64 | 72 | 74 | 77 | 80 | 3.9\% |
| Branded | 28 | 34 | 33 | 35 | 40 | 14.9\% |
| Private label | 36 | 39 | 41 | 42 | 40 | -5.2\% |
| Chilled | 55 | 45 | 47 | 44 | 43 | -3.2\% |
| Branded | 29 | 19 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 0.9\% |
| Private label | 27 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 23 | -6.5\% |
| From concentrate | 29 | 19 | 13 | 7 | 4 | -37.5\% |
| Branded | 9.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | -66.7\% |
| Private label | 20 | 19 | 13 | 7 | 4 | -35.8\% |
| Not from concentrate | 26 | 26 | 33 | 37 | 38 | 3.3\% |
| Branded | 19 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 2.2\% |
| Private label | 7 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 19 | 4.5\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 585 | 587 | 601 | 591 | 592 | 0.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branded | 384 | 374 | 372 | 359 | 365 | 1.7\% |
| Private label | 202 | 213 | 229 | 232 | 227 | -2.2\% |
| Ambient | 583 | 586 | 600 | 590 | 590 | 0.0\% |
| Branded | 382 | 373 | 371 | 359 | 364 | 1.5\% |
| Private label | 201 | 212 | 229 | 232 | 227 | -2.2\% |
| From concentrate | 582 | 585 | 600 | 590 | 590 | 0.0\% |
| Branded | 381 | 373 | 371 | 358 | 364 | 1.5\% |
| Private label | 201 | 212 | 229 | 232 | 227 | -2.2\% |
| Not from concentrate | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | -39.0\% |
| Branded | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | -39.0\% |
| Chilled | 2.6 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 103.8\% |
| Branded | 1.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 170.0\% |
| Private label | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | -6.7\% |
| From concentrate | 2.4 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | -20.0\% |
| Branded | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | -33.3\% |
| Private label | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | -6.7\% |
| Not from concentrate | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 475.0\% |
| Branded | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 475.0\% |
| of which are smoothies | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | -15.4\% |
| Branded | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | -25.0\% |
| Private label | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | -5.3\% |

# Sweden 

Population: $\mathbf{9 . 7}$ million

Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 257 | 252 | 244 | 238 | 233 | $-2.0 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 201 | 197 | 190 | 183 | 175 | -4.1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 148 | 155 | 150 | 145 | 138 | -4.4\% |
|  | Private label | 54 | 42 | 40 | 38 | 37 | -2.8\% |
| Ambient |  | 72 | 58 | 56 | 50 | 47 | -7.0\% |
|  | Branded | 30 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | -5.6\% |
|  | Private label | 42 | 30 | 29 | 24 | 22 | -8.6\% |
| From concentrate |  | 71 | 58 | 55 | 49 | 46 | -7.8\% |
|  | Branded | 29 | 28 | 26 | 25 | 23 | -7.0\% |
|  | Private label | 42 | 30 | 29 | 24 | 22 | -8.6\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 30.0\% |
|  | Branded | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 30.0\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 30.0\% |
|  | Branded | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 30.0\% |
| Chilled |  | 129 | 139 | 134 | 133 | 129 | -2.9\% |
|  | Branded | 118 | 127 | 123 | 118 | 114 | -4.2\% |
|  | Private label | 12 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 7.4\% |
| From concentrate |  | 102 | 112 | 107 | 106 | 101 | -4.2\% |
|  | Branded | 93 | 102 | 99 | 95 | 89 | -5.9\% |
|  | Private label | 9 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 11.0\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 2.0\% |
|  | Branded | 25 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 2.9\% |
|  | Private label | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -4.5\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -7.7\% |
|  | Branded | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -12.0\% |
|  | Private label | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 27.4\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 55 | 55 | 54 | 55 | 58 | 5.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 37 | 39 | 38 | 39 | 43 | 11.1\% |
|  | Private label | 19 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 14 | -10.1\% |
| Ambient |  | 38 | 35 | 35 | 33 | 35 | 6.9\% |
|  | Branded | 19 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 24 | 17.2\% |
|  | Private label | 19 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 11 | -10.2\% |
| From concentrate |  | 38 | 35 | 35 | 33 | 35 | 6.9\% |
|  | Branded | 19 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 24 | 17.2\% |
|  | Private label | 19 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 11 | -10.2\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -10.5\% |
|  | Branded | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -27.1\% |
|  | Private label | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -9.4\% |
| Chilled |  | 17 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 2.0\% |
|  | Branded | 17 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 4.2\% |
|  | Private label | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | -9.4\% |
| From concentrate |  | 17 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 2.0\% |
|  | Branded | 17 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 4.2\% |
|  | Private label | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | -9.4\% |

NRLE UK
Population: $\mathbf{6 4 . 5}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Total | 1,405 | 1,369 | 1,329 | 1,277 | 1,192 | $-6.6 \%$ |

## Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice |  | 1,212 | 1,180 | 1,144 | 1,079 | 996 | -7.7\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 482 | 509 | 519 | 506 | 484 | -4.3\% |
|  | Private label | 730 | 670 | 625 | 573 | 511 | -10.8\% |
| Ambient |  | 551 | 503 | 458 | 402 | 358 | -10.9\% |
|  | Branded | 164 | 158 | 143 | 120 | 111 | -7.1\% |
|  | Private label | 386 | 346 | 314 | 282 | 247 | -12.6\% |
| From Concentrate |  | 551 | 503 | 458 | 402 | 358 | -10.9\% |
|  | Branded | 164 | 158 | 143 | 120 | 111 | -7.1\% |
|  | Private label | 386 | 346 | 314 | 282 | 247 | -12.6\% |
| Chilled |  | 661 | 676 | 687 | 677 | 637 | -5.8\% |
|  | Branded | 317 | 352 | 376 | 386 | 373 | -3.4\% |
|  | Private label | 344 | 325 | 311 | 291 | 264 | -9.0\% |
| From concentrate |  | 285 | 269 | 258 | 241 | 221 | -8.2\% |
|  | Branded | 20 | 20 | 18 | 16 | 15 | -7.2\% |
|  | Private label | 264 | 249 | 239 | 225 | 206 | -8.3\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 377 | 407 | 429 | 436 | 416 | -4.5\% |
|  | Branded | 297 | 331 | 357 | 370 | 358 | -3.2\% |
|  | Private label | 80 | 76 | 71 | 65 | 58 | -11.5\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 59 | 67 | 58 | 54 | 52 | -4.4\% |
|  | Branded | 53 | 61 | 52 | 49 | 47 | -4.4\% |
|  | Private label | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | -5.0\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars |  | 193 | 189 | 185 | 198 | 196 | -0.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Branded | 175 | 169 | 163 | 177 | 177 | -0.1\% |
|  | Private label | 18 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 20 | -6.8\% |
| Ambient |  | 149 | 149 | 141 | 138 | 133 | -3.9\% |
|  | Branded | 146 | 145 | 135 | 132 | 127 | -3.5\% |
|  | Private label | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | -10.8\% |
| From concentrate |  | 146 | 146 | 138 | 136 | 130 | -4.1\% |
|  | Branded | 144 | 142 | 132 | 130 | 125 | -3.7\% |
|  | Private label | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | -10.8\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6.6\% |
|  | Branded | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6.6\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Branded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Chilled |  | 44 | 41 | 44 | 60 | 63 | 6.4\% |
|  | Branded | 29 | 25 | 28 | 45 | 49 | 10.2\% |
|  | Private label | 15 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 14 | -5.1\% |
| From concentrate |  | 44 | 41 | 43 | 46 | 53 | 16.1\% |
|  | Branded | 29 | 25 | 27 | 31 | 39 | 26.2\% |
|  | Private label | 15 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 14 | -5.1\% |
| Not from concentrate |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 10 | -25.3\% |
|  | Branded | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 10 | -25.3\% |
| of which are smoothies |  | 16 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 23 | 24.1\% |
|  | Branded | 10 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 36.5\% |
|  | Private label | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | -1.0\% |



Bulgaria
Population: $\mathbf{7 . 2}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 72 | 68 | 67 | 63 | 63 | $1.1 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 18 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | $1.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Private Label | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Branded | 16 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 13 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Ambient | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 14 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Chilled | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | $-6.9 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 17 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 13 | $-4.4 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.7 | $89.9 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 55 | 52 | 51 | 49 | 49 | $1.0 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 47 | 44 | 42 | 41 | 41 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Private label | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | $-3.0 \%$ |



Cyprus
Population: 1.2 million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 32 | 31 | 32 | 30 | 28 | $-4.5 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 21 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 18 | $-5.4 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Private Label | 21 | 20 | 21 | 18 | 17 | $-5.6 \%$ |
|  | Branded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |



## Denmark

Population: $\mathbf{5 . 6}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 119 | 114 | 111 | 111 | 108 | $-2.7 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 119 | 113 | 110 | 110 | 104 | $-5.6 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 59 | 54 | 57 | 54 | 53 | $-2.3 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 60 | 59 | 53 | 56 | 51 |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 4.0 | $357.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Branded | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 3.6 | $472.0 \%$ |
| Private label | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | $70.0 \%$ |



## Croatia

Population: $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 74 | 71 | 68 | 67 | 58 | $-13.5 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | $7.6 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Private Label | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 11 | $7.4 \%$ |
|  | Branded | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 63 | 60 | 57 | 55 | 45 | $-18.2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 49 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 38 | $-17.0 \%$ |
| Private label | 14 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 7 | $-24.4 \%$ |



## Czech Republic <br> Population: $\mathbf{1 0 . 6}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 105 | 88 | 82 | 89 | 94 | $5.4 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 70 | 54 | 49 | 51 | 55 | $7.8 \%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Private Label | 34 | 22 | 17 | 15 | 14 | $-2.7 \%$ |  |
|  | Branded | 36 | 32 | 32 | 37 | 41 | $12.1 \%$ |
| Ambient | 70 | 54 | 48 | 50 | 54 | $7.9 \%$ |  |
| Chilled | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| From concentrate | 70 | 54 | 48 | 48 | 51 | $6.5 \%$ |  |
| Not from concentrate | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 4.2 | $27.3 \%$ |  |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 34 | 33 | 34 | 37 | 38 | $2.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Branded | 23 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 28 | $5.6 \%$ |
| Private label | 11 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | $-6.6 \%$ |

Estonia
Population: 1.3 million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 32 | 29 | 27 | 26 | 25 | $-2.1 \%$ |

## Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | $1.1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Branded | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
|  | Private Label | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| $0.8 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ambient | 13 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Chilled | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1.2 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 13 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $-1.5 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 18 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 13 | $-5.0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 16 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 12 | $-5.3 \%$ |
| Private label | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1.9 \%$ |

## ${ }_{m}$ hw Finland <br> Population: $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 166 | 164 | 155 | 149 | 137 | -7.9\% |
| Fruit juice (100\% juice content) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total fruit juice | 145 | 144 | 135 | 129 | 119 | -8.0\% |
| Branded | 128 | 127 | 119 | 114 | 105 | -7.9\% |
| Private Label | 18 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | -9.5\% |
| Ambient | 95 | 93 | 80 | 77 | 70 | -9.5\% |
| Chilled | 50 | 50 | 55 | 52 | 49 | -5.9\% |
| From concentrate | 132 | 130 | 123 | 118 | 109 | -7.6\% |
| Not from concentrate | 14 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 9 | -12.8\% |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 19 | $-7.0 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 18 | $-7.1 \%$ |
| Private label | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | $-1.8 \%$ |



## Hungary <br> Population: $\mathbf{9 . 9}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 107 | 102 | 95 | 91 | 101 | $10.9 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 43 | 40 | 37 | 36 | 40 | $9.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 25 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | $3.6 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 17 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 12 |
| Ambient | 42 | 40 | 37 | 36 | 40 | $9.5 \%$ |
| Chilled | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $40.0 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 41 | 38 | 36 | 35 | 38 | $9.2 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | $20.6 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 64 | 61 | 58 | 55 | 61 | $11.9 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Branded | 45 | 41 | 34 | 34 | 36 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Private label | 19 | 20 | 24 | 21 | 26 | $23.3 \%$ |



## Latvia

Population: $\mathbf{2 . 0}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 28 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | $-0.5 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | $0.4 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | $1.6 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| $-16.1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ambient | 11 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Chilled | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | $-21.2 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $-11.9 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 17 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | $-1.0 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 15 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | $-0.1 \%$ |
| Private label | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $-11.7 \%$ |



Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 180 | 168 | 150 | 137 | 131 | $-4.1 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 123 | 107 | 93 | 82 | 77 | $-5.8 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 105 | 90 | 74 | 65 | 62 | $-4.6 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 17 | 17 | 19 | 17 | 15 |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 57 | 61 | 57 | 55 | 54 | $-1.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Branded | 37 | 40 | 41 | 39 | 38 | $-3.8 \%$ |
| Private label | 20 | 21 | 17 | 15 | 16 | $4.1 \%$ |

Ireland
Population: 4.8 million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | $\%$ change |
| Total | 58 | 57 | 53 | 50 | 45 | $-10.9 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 52 | 50 | 47 | 44 | 39 | $-12.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Branded | 29 | 29 | 26 | 26 | 21 | $-18.0 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 23 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 18 |
| Ambient | 33 | 31 | 27 | 25 | 21 | $-3.7 \%$ |
| Chilled | 19 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 18 | $-7.9 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 40 | 38 | 33 | 31 | 27 | $-11.9 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 11 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 11 | $-12.3 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | $-2.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branded | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $-4.4 \%$ |
| Private label | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $17.6 \%$ |



Lithuania
Population: 2.9 million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 41 | 40 | 39 | 40 | 38 | $-5.3 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 16 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | $2.0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | $2.4 \%$ |
|  | Branded | Private Label | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | $-1.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ambient | 16 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Chilled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $100.0 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 16 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | $34.5 \%$ |

## Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 24 | $-9.2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 21 | $-9.8 \%$ |
| Private label | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | $-4.2 \%$ |



Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | $-1.2 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | $-1.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Branded | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $-2.1 \%$ |
|  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $-1.0 \%$ |
| Private Label | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | $-3.0 \%$ |
| Ambient | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $10.1 \%$ |
| Chilled | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $-3.0 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | $0.0 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Private label | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $-2.3 \%$ |

Norway
Population: $\mathbf{5 . 1}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 153 | 153 | 154 | 150 | 146 | $-2.7 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 138 | 138 | 141 | 138 | 135 | $-2.4 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 84 | 84 | 72 | 67 | 66 | $-1.3 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 54 | 54 | 69 | 71 | 68 |
| Ambient | 84 | 82 | 78 | 71 | 66 | $-6.4 \%$ |
| Chilled | 54 | 56 | 63 | 67 | 69 | $2.9 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 115 | 113 | 112 | 104 | 99 | $-5.0 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 23 | 25 | 29 | 34 | 36 | $5.6 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | $-6.1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $-8.8 \%$ |
| Private label | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | $-4.7 \%$ |



## Romania

Population: 19.9 million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 68 | 59 | 56 | 54 | 54 | $0.9 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 24 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | $-1.1 \%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 21 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 15 | $1.3 \%$ |  |
|  | Private Label | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | $-7.4 \%$ |
| Ambient | 24 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | $-1.1 \%$ |  |
| From concentrate | 24 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 18 | $-3.4 \%$ |  |
| Not from concentrate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | $28.6 \%$ |  |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 44 | 37 | 35 | 33 | 34 | $2.1 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 37 | 30 | 27 | 26 | 26 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Private label | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | $8.3 \%$ |

5
Malta
Population: $\mathbf{0 . 4} \mathbf{~ m i l l i o n}$

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 11 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 14 | $13.5 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $1.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $0.6 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Ambient | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $1.2 \%$ |
| Chilled | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | $5.1 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 9 | $21.4 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | $5.1 \%$ |
| Private label | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | $14.8 \%$ |

## Portugal <br> Population: $\mathbf{1 0 . 6}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 116 | 105 | 102 | 104 | 104 | $0.3 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 27 | 24 | 23 | 20 | 19 | $-3.3 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Branded | 12 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
|  | $-2.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Private Label | 15 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 12 |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 89 | 81 | 79 | 84 | 85 | $1.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Branded | 63 | 56 | 52 | 56 | 58 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Private label | 26 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 26 | $-5.2 \%$ |

Slovakia
Population: $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 47 | 39 | 36 | 34 | 38 | $9.0 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 27 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 22 | $17.4 \%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Private Label | 14 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 8 | $18.2 \%$ |
|  | Branded | 14 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 15 | $16.9 \%$ |
| Ambient | 27 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 20 | $14.1 \%$ |  |
| Ambient | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 2.1 | $61.5 \%$ |  |
| Ambient | 27 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 20 | $14.1 \%$ |  |
| Not from concentrate | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 2.1 | $61.5 \%$ |  |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 20 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 15 | $-1.3 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 13 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Private label | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | $-13.3 \%$ |

Slovenia
Population: $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ million

| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| Total | 41 | 39 | 36 | 33 | 30 | $-9.2 \%$ |

Fruit juice ( $100 \%$ juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | $-5.4 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | $1.9 \%$ |
|  | Branded | Private Label | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 28 | 26 | 23 | 20 | 17 | $-11.7 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 17 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 10 | $-9.7 \%$ |
| Private label | 12 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 7 | $-14.3 \%$ |


| Total fruit juice and nectars |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | $\%$ change |
| Total | 204 | 201 | 197 | 196 | 194 | $-1.2 \%$ |

Fruit juice (100\% juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 155 | 153 | 150 | 150 | 148 | $-1.3 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 85 | 83 | 79 | 78 | 77 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| Private Label | 70 | 70 | 72 | 72 | 70 | $-2.2 \%$ |
| Ambient | 141 | 138 | 134 | 133 | 131 | $-1.9 \%$ |
| Chilled | 14 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 17 | $2.8 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 140 | 137 | 133 | 131 | 129 | $-1.8 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 15 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 19 | $2.2 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 49 | 49 | 47 | 46 | 46 | $-0.6 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branded | 16 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 14 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Private label | 33 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | $-1.5 \%$ |



Turkey
Population: $\mathbf{7 6 . 9}$ million

## Total fruit juice and nectars

| Volume, million litres* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | \% change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 624 | 678 | 632 | 658 | 705 | $7.1 \%$ |

Fruit juice ( $100 \%$ juice content)

| Total fruit juice | 50 | 53 | 51 | 51 | 52 | $3.2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 46 | 48 | 47 | 46 | 48 | $3.2 \%$ |
|  | Private Label | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Ambient | 47 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 47 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Chilled | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | $11.2 \%$ |
| From concentrate | 41 | 44 | 42 | 42 | 43 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Not from concentrate | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | $9.7 \%$ |

Nectars (25-99\% juice content)

| Total nectars | 574 | 625 | 581 | 607 | 652 | $7.4 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Branded | 507 | 544 | 505 | 528 | 570 | $7.9 \%$ |
| Private label | 67 | 80 | 76 | 79 | 82 | $4.0 \%$ |

## Definitions

## Fruit juices and nectars

Juice: $100 \%$ pure fruit juice or vegetable juice with no added ingredients, except permitted minerals and vitamins for the purpose of fortification and permitted additives. Includes products: from concentrate, not from concentrate, chilled, ambient, frozen concentrated juice, smoothies.
Excludes carbonated juice.
Nectars: $25-99 \%$ juice content. Diluted fruit/vegetable juice and pulp, to which sweetening agents (eg sugar, honey, syrups and/or sweeteners) need to be added for the purposes of production. Permitted minerals and vitamins for the purpose of fortification and permitted additives may be added. Whilst juice content is required to be equal to or in excess of $25 \%$ by volume, minimum juice content varies according to the fruit in question. Includes products: from concentrate, not from concentrate, chilled, ambient and smoothies.
Smoothies: Comprise blended fruit puree and juice drinks with a thick, smooth texture, sometimes incorporating a dairy element (yogurt) and/or functional elements (eg aloe vera, gingko, ginseng).
Both chilled and ambient products can be found. Includes packaged products and products made to order in on-premise outlets. Categorised under the juice and nectars categories, depending on juice content and/or ingredients. Includes smoothies containing less than $50 \%$ dairy.
Not from concentrate (NFC): The fruit/vegetable is squeezed in the country of origin, lightly pasteurised and frozen or aseptically packed for shipment to where it will be sold.
From concentrate ( $\mathbf{F C}$ ): The fruit/vegetable is squeezed and concentrated through evaporation of natural water content by evaporators, before being frozen and shipped to the country for use for packaging. The product is then reconstituted to its original strength by addition of the same amount of water.
Freshly squeezed juice: Freshly squeezed fruit, not pasteurised, chilled with a shelf life of a few days.
Chilled juice: Relates to products that are distributed and sold via the chilled distribution chain. These products will be marketed and positioned as chilled products and will usually be perceived by consumers as requiring chilling (although this may or may not be technically necessary).
Ambient juice: Relates to products that are distributed and marketed via an ambient distribution chain. Note, these products may be placed in chillers at the point of sale, eg in convenience stores because consumers prefer to purchase a chilled beverage, but would not usually be perceived as needing to be chilled.
Flavour mixes: No single flavour is perceived to be dominant eg tropical mixes, red fruits, summer fruits, cocktail mix, multi-fruits.
Still drinks: Flavoured ready-to-drink, non-carbonated products, which may be fruit or non-fruit flavoured and have a juice content of 0-24.9\%. Sugar, artificial flavouring and colouring may be added.
Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding.
Blank/0.0 denotes data not available or volume less than 0.05 million litres or zero. FJN: Fruit juice and nectars

## AlJN Report Methodology

Within the beverage industry, Canadean is recognised as the beverage information specialist and has been commissioned to produce the 2015 AIJN European Fruit Juice Market Report.

All data and analysis in the report has been produced using Canadean's in-depth beverage market database and our latest Annual Market Insight and Quarterly Beverage Tracker analysis reports.
The key to our methodology is that we operate in partnership both with manufacturers and their suppliers, allowing our in-country experts to cross-examine and reconcile consumption volumes through the value chain.
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## About AlJN

AIJN is the representative association of the fruit juice industry in the EU. It represents the industry from the fruit processors to the packers of the consumer products. AlJN's foundation goes back to 1958. The AIJN office is situated in the heart of the Brussels European quarter.

## Key AIJN Aims and Objectives

1. Represent the interests and promote the image of the European Fruit Juice Industry in all its contacts with EU Institutions and other relevant organizations and stakeholders;
2. Support and lobby European Union Institutions on all aspects of policy and legislation affecting the production, marketing, sales and trade in fruit juices and nectars in the EU;
3. Defend and promote juices as nutritious products which are an integral part of a healthy diet, through the AlJN Juice Marketing Campaign;
4. Encourage and support, through the Fruit Juice CSR Platform, juice companies to integrate corporate social responsibility in all stages in their supply chain;
5. Provide, in collaboration with the European Quality Control System (EQCS), mechanisms and instruments securing safe and authentic goods to maintain and increase consumer confidence in the good and healthy image of fruit and vegetable juices and nectars;
6. Inform and advise the fruit juice industry on all aspects of European legislation likely to affect their businesses;
7. Liaise with national, regional and worldwide interests representing the fruit juice industry to foster and achieve overall AlJN objectives.

## Membership

The AlJN membership is composed of national fruit juice associations from 16 EU Member States and from two countries that applied for EU membership. For more information on membership benefits, please visit www.aijn.org

## AIJN Executive Board

President, Marjan Skotnicki-Hoogland, Managing Director, FrieslandCampina Riedel B.V., Netherlands
1st Vice-President, Jörgen Dirksen, CEO, Rynkeby Foods A/S, Denmark
2nd Vice-President, Angel Sanchez, Director General, Conserve Italia, Italy
Members, Bruno Thévenin, CEO PepsiCo, France; Thomas MERTENS, Managing Director Supply Chain, Wesergold Getränkeindustrie GmbH \& Co. KG, Germany; Piotr Podoba, CEO, Döhler Sp. z o.o., Poland; Wolfgang Schwald, General Manager Fruit, Processing \& Sales, Rauch Fruchtsäfte GmbH \& Co OG, Austria; Bruno Van Gompel, Technical Director, Coca-Cola Western Europe, Belgium; Helmuth Brandstaetter, CEO Zipperle AG, Italy; José Jordão, Executive Director, Sumol+Compal, Portugal; David Saint, Managing Director, Refresco Gerber UK Limited, United Kingdom.

## National Associations Members of AIJN

Austria: Verband der Österreichischen Fruchtsaft - und Fruchtsirupindustrie
Belgium: AJUNEC
Cyprus: The Cyprus Canners \& Fruit Juice Manufacturers Association Denmark: Danish Fruit Juice and Jam Industries
Finland: Juice and Preserves Industries' Association
France: Union Nationale des Producteurs de Jus de Fruits (UNIJUS)
Germany: Verband der Deutschen Fruchtsaft-Industrie e.V. (VDF)
Greece: Biofresh SA
Ireland: Irish Beverage Council
Italy: A.I.I.P.A., Conserve Italia Scarl, Federvini
Netherlands: FWS
Poland: Polish Association of Juice Producers (KUPS)
Portugal: Sumol-Compal
Spain: ASOZUMOS
Sweden: Swedish Juice Association
UK: British Soft Drinks Association Ltd
Serbia: Serbian Fruit Juice Producers Association (SFJPA)
Turkey: Turkish Fruit Juice Industry Association (MEYED)

In addition, there is a long list of Observer members that are national associations from non-European countries, individual companies who are suppliers of raw materials, packaging materials, equipment, ingredients or processing aids to the EU fruit and vegetable juices industry and/or to associations representing these suppliers. Current Observer members:
BGERICAP


## European Fruit Juice Association

Rue de la Loi 221, Box 5, B-1040 Brussels
Tel: +32 (0)2 235.06.20
Fax: +32 (0)2 282.94.20
Email: aijn@aijn.org

