Shipping wine with the Carriers

James Delaney Director NAWR

What Have The States Been Up to?

- Sting operations to individual retailers
- Increased pressure on carriers to police shipping
- Acquiring subpoenas for shipping histories
- Filing lawsuits based on sting activity and information provided by the carriers

What Have The Carriers Been Up to?

- Acquiescing to pressure from the states
- Complying with any/all reporting requests
- Doing more thorough research on all "incidents" within their network (damages, complaints, etc)
- Implementing stricter agreements with shippers depending on their business model:
 - Winery
 - Retailer

The UPS Retailer Agreement

- UPS now signing different agreements based on business type (winery or retailer)
- "Addendum A":
 - Lists where you can ship based on the type of transaction (on site, off site, retailer)
 - Last updated March, 2017
- Requiring shippers to establish a "compliance department"

The UPS Retailer Agreement

- Reserves the right to audit the shipper for compliance which includes:
 - Opening and inspecting packages
 - Reviewing shipper's:
 - Books
 - Records
 - Facilities
 - Customer lists
 - Compliance program
- May not return any unauthorized shipments
- Indemnifies UPS in the event of a breach

UPS States for the Shipment of Wine

Destination State	Winery Direct Shipment	Winery On- Site Purchase Shipment	Wine Retailer Shipment
Alabama	No	No	No
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arizona ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Arkansas ^p	No	Yes	No
California ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{R1}
Colorado ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Connecticut ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Delaware	No	Yes	No
Florida ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Georgia ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Hawaii ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Idaho ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{R1}
Illinois ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Indiana ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Iowa ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Kansas ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Kentucky	No	No	No
Louisiana ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maine ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Maryland ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Massachusetts ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Michigan ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Mississippi	No	No	No
Missouri ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{R1}
Montana ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Nebraska ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nevada ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Hampshire ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Jersey ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
New Mexico ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{R1}
New York ^p	Yes ^{R2}	Yes ^{R2}	No Intra
North Carolina ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
North Dakota ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ohio ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Oklahoma	No	Yes	No
Oregon ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Puerto Rico	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rhode Island	No	Yes	No Intra
South Carolina ^p	Yes	Yes	No
South Dakota ^p	Yes	Yes	No

• Winery Direct: 43

• Winery On-Site: 47

• Retailer Out of State: 16

• Retailer Intra-State: 15

Destination State	Winery Direct Shipment	Winery On- Site Purchase Shipment	Wine Retailer Shipment
Tennessee ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Texas ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Utah	No	No	No
Vermont	No	No	No
Virginia ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington ^p	Yes	Yes	No Intra
Washington D.C.	Yes	Yes	Yes
West Virginia ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin ^p	Yes	Yes	No
Wyoming ^p	Yes	Yes	Yes

The FedEx Retailer Agreement

- Separate agreements based on business model (winery or retailer)
- Not as onerous as the UPS agreement
- Mentions specifically getting NH, NY & VA Permits
- Indemnifies FedEx in the event of a breach
- Reserves the right to dispose of improper shipments

FedEx States for the Shipment of Wine

FedEx Retailer Wine Shipping State Pairing Guide

Out of State Retailer: 14

• Intrastate Retailer: 33

<u>State</u>	Interstate Wine Shipping by OOS Retailer	Intrastate Retailer Wine Shipping	<u>State</u>	Interstate Wine Shipping by OOS Retailer	Intrastate Retailer Wine Shipping
Alabama	NO	NO	Mississippi	NO	NO
Alaska	YES¹	YES1	Missouri	NO	YES
Arizona	NO	YES	Montana	NO	NO
Arkansas	NO	NO	Nebraska	YES	YES
California	YES ²	YES	Nevada	YES	YES
Colorado	NO	YES	New Hampshire	YES ⁴	YES ⁴
Connecticut	NO	YES	New Jersey New Mexico	NO YES ²	YES YES
Delaware	NO	NO	New York	NO YES	YES
District of Columbia	YES	YES	North Carolina	NO	YES
Florida	NO	YES ³	North Dakota	YES	YES
			Ohio	NO NO	YES
Georgia	NO	NO	Oklahoma	NO NO	NO
Hawaii	NO	NO	Oregon	YES	YES
Idaho	YES ²	YES	Pennsylvania	NO	NO
Illinois	NO	YES	Rhode Island	NO	YES
Indiana	NO	YES	South Carolina	NO	YES
lowa	NO	NO	South Dakota	NO	NO
Kansas	NO	NO	Tennessee	NO	NO
Kentucky	NO	NO	Texas	NO	YES
Louisiana	YES	YES	Utah	NO	NO
Maine	NO	YES	Vermont	NO	NO
Maryland	NO	NO	Virginia	YES	YES
Massachusetts	NO	YES	Washington	NO	YES
			West Virginia	YES ⁵	YES⁵
Michigan	NO	YES	Wisconsin	NO	NO
Minnesota	NO	YES	Wyoming	YES	YES

What the future holds

- Continued pressure from the states on the carriers
- New approaches for carriers to catch and eliminate inappropriate shipments:
 - Proactively monitoring shipment detail
 - Returning or disposing of shipments to prohibited states
 - Developing programming so shipping labels cannot even be created
- More solutions for "delivery on the first attempt"

What do we need to do?

- Required (more than ever) to be aware of the landscape
- Need to develop & maintain innovative programs
- Understand and work within "grey areas"
- Work locally to develop programs in difficult states
- Keep options open in changing landscape
- Remain dynamic and able to shift as paradigms change

Thank You!