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## INTRO

Free the Grapes!, the advocacy group for wine consumers, shares a look-back at the DtC channel.

Two decades ago, who would have imagined that thousands of wineries of all sizes, throughout the US, would have the option of shipping directly to millions of wine lovers, and participate in a $\$ 2$ billion sales channel? In the 1990s, a few industry leaders had this vision and the report you are reading is a testament to their hard work and the generous contributions of many.

Picture the DtC landscape in the late 1990's: Wineries were threatened with lawsuits and felony penalties over the fallacy of underage access and tax revenue loss. The industry's response was to augment its legislative and legal actions with a "third prong," Public Relations, to rally frustrated wine lovers to our cause. Free the Grapes! was founded and directed by the Wine Institute, Napa Valley Vintners, WineAmerica, Family Winemakers of America, and the Coalition for Free Trade.

The goal of their coordinated efforts was, and is, to augment, not replace, the three-tier system with legal, regulated direct shipping. Working together, we aimed to increase the number of legal DtC states and to streamline onerous regulations, which would lead to increased consumer choice in wine. The results are impressive:

Since 1998, winery-shipping states have increased from 17 to 43 , which represent $90 \%$ of the US population. Yes, this includes some difficult-but-legal states like Arkansas, Arizona, and New Jersey. But state-level solutions are complex, and companies like ShipCompliant have simplified reporting and processes.

The role of Free the Grapes! is to convert consumer frustration into constructive action. By informing consumers and partners at events, through publicity and digital media, we have created a platform for consumers to personalize and submit letters of support directly to their state legislators.

Ultimately, our goal is to complete our mission and "retire" Free the Grapes! (like Coalition for Free Trade did in 2014). But our industry's fight is not over. We need local consumer constituents to help us defend challenges to existing statutes, to help us open the last holdouts like Pennsylvania and Delaware, and to remove onerous regulations such as the "winery visit penalty" in Arizona and the capacity cap limits in Ohio and New Jersey.

## Free the Grapes!

shackles@freethegrapes.org

## THE CREATION OF THE 2016 DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER WINE SHIPPING REPORT

The Direct-to-Consumer Wine Shipping Report is an annual collaboration between ShipCompliant and Wines \& Vines dedicated only to wines shipped directly from wineries to the end consumer.

To create this report, Wines \& Vines Analytics created a model that extrapolates millions of anonymous direct shipping transactions from ShipCompliant across Wines \& Vines' database of US wineries. The model tracks sales by winery region, annual production, destination of shipments, varietal, and price points.

2015 WINERIES BY PRODUCTION SIZE


## Total 8,638

Large Wineries:
Medium Wineries:

## Small Wineries:

Very Small Wineries:
Limited Production Wineries:

500,000 + case production 50,000-499,999 case production
5,000-49,999 case production
1,000-4,999 case production
Up to 999 case production

## 2016 DIRECT SHIPPING OVERVIEW

Since 2010, the value of the DtC shipping industry has increased 66\%, and 2015 proved to be another growth year for the channel. Wine shipment volume neared 4.29 million cases, an $8.5 \%$ increase over 2014, and sales exceeded $\$ 1.97$ billion, an $8.1 \%$ increase. These rates are lower than both 2014's record-breaking year of $13.6 \%$ increase in volume and $15.5 \%$ increase in value, as well as the five-year growth averages of 9.7\% for volume and $10.7 \%$ for value.

Growth rates for volume and value in 2015 were similar, and the slight difference of these rates can be attributed to a $0.4 \%$ difference from 2014's average price-per-bottle of wine shipped. The average price decreased from $\$ 38.40$ in 2014 to $\$ 38.23$ in 2015.

What is striking, though, is that this progress outpaces that of the retail wine marketplace. The DtC's $8.5 \%$ volume growth exceeds the $2.2 \%$ growth of the retail off-premise wine volume, according to

Nielsen. Additionally, the $8.1 \%$ value growth of the DtC industry outpaced what Nielsen found was a 6\% increase in value of the wine retail marketplace.

2015's most notable addition to the DtC states was Massachusetts. After years of legal and political wrangling, Massachusetts consumers welcomed DtC shipments into their homes. The 2015 DtC Wine Shipping Report predicted the entry of this state would result in a $\$ 29$ million bump for the industry, and the results were close, at $\$ 27.5$ million. The same model predicts shipments to Massachusetts will more than double in 2016, as more wineries will become permitted to enter the market, and more buyers will become aware of the option to ship direct.

Also notable this year is the continued surge of shipments from Oregon wineries. Shipments of Pinot Noir, the state's signature grape, outpace the market in every aspect.

## 2010-2015 GROWTH IN VOLUME AND VALUE



Total Volume


Total Value

## 2010-2015 AVERAGE PRICE-PER-BOTTLE

$\$ 39.00$
\$38.50
\$38.00
$\$ 37.50$
$\$ 37.00$
$\$ 36.50$
\$36.00
\$35.50

| 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## BY MONTH

Only five months account for the $0.4 \%$ reduction in average price-per-bottle shipped in 2015. During June, July, and August of 2015, consumers saw an $8.2 \%$ decrease in the average price-per-bottle shipped over the same period in 2014. Additionally, the months of January and February experienced a $7.5 \%$ decrease in average price-per-bottle shipped compared to 2014.

July and August remain the months when the average price-per-bottle shipped is at its lowest. Consumers often demand more white wine and rose during these summer months, which typically have a lower price point than red wines. These hot weather months,
along with extremely cold weather months, are seeing significant reductions in the average price of varietals that are popular all year. This could suggest that discounts have been applied on the same products, or that different, lower priced products are being sold and shipped.

Moderate temperature months of March and April saw price-per-bottle increases of $2.8 \%$ and $5.0 \%$, respectively, over the same months in 2014.


Volume


## 2015 AVERAGE PRICE-PER-BOTTLE BY MONTH



## 2015 PRICE-PER-BOTTLE SEASONALITY



## BY WINERY SIZE

## 2015 PERCENT OF TOTAL VOLUME AND VALUE BY WINERY SIZE




Medium Large

2010-2015 GROWTH IN VOLUME, VALUE, AND PRICE-PER-BOTTLE BY WINERY SIZE


## 2015 BY WINERY SIZE

ave polume

## 8.7\%

 13.3\% 4.2\% \$57.36volume
increase in value
bottle price
avg. price per bottle

## LIMITED PRODUCTION WINERIES (UP TO 999 CASES)

Limited Production wineries are the smallest wineries in the industry. These 3,157 wineries make up $37 \%$ of the U.S. winery landscape in 2015. After two years of falling prices, 2015 showed a $12.9 \%$ increase in average price-per-bottle shipped from $\$ 42.40$ to $\$ 47.87$. This price is still down from the 2012 high of $\$ 55.48$ per bottle of wine shipped.

## VERY SMALL WINERIES (1,000-4,999 CASES)

The Very Small segment is the largest, with over $40 \%$ of all US wineries falling into this category. In 2015, Very Small wineries overtook Medium sized wineries for second place ranking of dollar value of wine shipped, with its $13.3 \%$ growth. This momentum continues from 2014's $19 \%$ and 2013's 30\% increase in dollar value. 2015 total sales were $\$ 445$ million.

## SMALL WINERIES (5,000 - 49,999 CASES)

With $44 \%$ of the total DtC shipping channel volume and $48 \%$ of its dollar value, these wineries have remained relatively stable. In 2015, however, their performance slightly underperformed compared to industry average. While this segment continues to grow, it only saw a 6.6\% growth in dollar value of wine shipped, and $6.3 \%$ increase in the volume of shipments.

## MEDIUM WINERIES (50,000 - 499,999 CASES)

Medium sized wineries only account for $3 \%$ of all US wineries, but maintain $32 \%$ of the total volume of wine shipped direct-to-consumer. Additionally, these Medium production sized wineries claimed 23\% of the value of the DtC channel, growing 5\% over 2014. The price reduction seen in 2015 is the fifth year straight Medium wineries decreased average price-per-bottle shipped, resulting in \$26.87 in 2015.

## LARGE WINERIES (500,000 OR MORE CASES)

There's only a handful of wineries that produce more than a half million cases of wine in the United States, and combined they maintain $5.5 \%$ of the market. It is notable that these Large wineries continue to decrease their average price in the DtC shipping channel. With a $5.4 \%$ reduction in the average price of a bottle shipped in 2015, this category of wineries shows the lowest price of all, at $\$ 24.53$ average price-per-bottle.

## BY VARIETAL

Cabernet Sauvignon, Pinot Noir, Red Blends, Chardonnay, and Zinfandel combined to make up 61\% of all wines shipped in 2015. Momentum for Pinot Noir drastically dropped from 2014's 22\% growth rate to a 2\% growth rate in 2015.

Red Blends picked up Pinot Noir's momentum, as they experienced a $5 \%$ increase in price-per-bottle shipped, which is the highest price increase among all varietals. These wines also experienced a $20 \%$ bump in the volume of wines shipped in 2015, outpacing
the industry's $8.5 \%$ volume growth. While significant, this varietal is still recovering from its major volume drop over the two previous years.

The final story from the 2015 data is the case of Syrah. Syrah continues to suffer in the DtC shipping channel, seeing a decline in demand and price. Overall, the varietal had a 6\% decrease in price. However, some regions are seeing more success selling Syrah than others, as the regional analysis of shipments shows.

## PINOT NOIR



PINOT NOIR Decreasing from $22 \%$ growth in volume to $2 \%$ growth in volume, Pinot Noir didn't have as strong of a year as in 2014.

## RED BLENDS

20\%

## RED BLENDS There was a

 20\% increase in volume of Red Blends shipped in 2015 over 2014.
## SYRAH



SYRAH Since 2011, Syrah volume is down -7.6\% compared to overall industry volume growth of $+45 \%$.

## 2015 GROWTH IN VALUE BY VARIETAL



## BY PRICE CATEGORY

Sixty-seven percent of all wine shipped in 2015 fell into the \$40 and Under Category. Traditionally, lower priced wines aren't associated with the DtC channel, but the $\$ 15$ and Under category saw a $27.7 \%$ increase in volume of shipments in 2015, bringing its share of shipments to $22.5 \%$-the highest volume share of any category.

On the other side of the spectrum, wines priced at $\$ 100$ or greater also saw significant increase in volume and value of wine shipped in 2015. Wines priced $\$ 100$ or more saw a $19 \%$ increase in volume and a $21 \%$ increase in the value of shipments. While these wines represent only $5.8 \%$ of all wine shipped, they produce $25.2 \%$ of the total value of the DtC shipping channel.

## 2015 PERCENT OF VOLUME AND VALUE BY PRICE CATEGORY



GROWTH IN VOLUME BY PRICE CATEGORY (1 YEAR VERSUS 5 YEAR)


## 2015 BY PRICE CATEGORY

|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm$ in Volume | Value (USD \$) | \% of Total Value | $\pm$ in Value | Avg. \$/ Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$200 and over | 49,294 | 1.1\% | 15.8\% | \$178,723,561 | 9.1\% | 25.7\% | \$302.14 | 8.5\% |
| \$150-\$199.99 | 62,464 | 1.5\% | 18.5\% | \$125,591,002 | 6.4\% | 17.9\% | \$167.55 | -0.6\% |
| \$100-\$149.99 | 136,732 | 3.2\% | 20.1\% | \$191,785,834 | 9.8\% | 18.2\% | \$116.89 | -1.6\% |
| \$80-\$99.99 | 174,394 | 4.1\% | 3.0\% | \$182,509,986 | 9.3\% | 3.7\% | \$87.21 | 0.7\% |
| \$60-\$79.99 | 291,020 | 6.8\% | 9.0\% | \$236,496,728 | 12.0\% | 9.0\% | \$67.72 | 0.0\% |
| \$50-\$59.99 | 238,655 | 5.6\% | 14.3\% | \$155,109,974 | 7.9\% | 14.8\% | \$54.16 | 0.5\% |
| \$40-\$49.99 | 383,133 | 8.9\% | -4.6\% | \$202,201,869 | 10.3\% | -4.9\% | \$43.98 | -0.3\% |
| \$30-\$39.99 | 560,822 | 13.1\% | -1.4\% | \$230,595,931 | 11.7\% | -1.2\% | \$34.26 | 0.2\% |
| \$20-\$29.99 | 837,903 | 19.5\% | 2.0\% | \$248,006,771 | 12.6\% | 2.3\% | \$24.67 | 0.2\% |
| \$15-\$19.99 | 468,435 | 10.9\% | 1.0\% | \$97,262,534 | 4.9\% | 0.8\% | \$17.30 | -0.2\% |
| Under \$15 | 1,002,798 | 23.4\% | 27.7\% | \$118,384,009 | 6.0\% | 23.7\% | \$9.84 | -3.1\% |
| TOTAL | 4,286,743 | 100\% | 8.5\% | \$1,966,668,198 | 100\% | 8.1\% | \$38.23 | -0.4\% |

## 2015 PERCENT OF VOLUME AND VALUE BY PRICE CATEGORY


$\$ 100$ and up
\$40-\$100 Under \$40

## BY WINERY REGION

This report defines the region of shipments as Napa County, Sonoma County, Oregon, Washington, the Rest of California and the Rest of the U.S. Among these six segments, Napa County unsurprisingly continues to dominate the DtC landscape from both a volume and value perspective. Most notably, the value of DtC shipments from Napa County wineries surpassed $\$ 1$ billion in value for the first time. Now, shipments from Napa County account for just over $50 \%$ of the total value of the DtC shipping market, while capturing only $32 \%$ of the overall volume of the shipping channel.

The ongoing fight for second place continues between the Sonoma County and Rest of California regions. In 2015, Rest of California overtook Sonoma for second most wine shipped on a dollar value basis, a position it lost to Sonoma in 2013. While neither of these
regions had significant growth, the Rest of California had slightly more shipments, which allowed it to move up in the ranks.

Oregon continues to thrive, with a $15 \%$ increase in the value of DtC shipments in 2015, which is almost double that of the industry average and a continuation of the region's 2014 momentum.

The Washington State segment is showing normal growth, with a slight decrease in prices and slight increase in volume. However, the lower prices have translated to a slower increase rate than the overall DtC channel. Finally, wineries in the Rest of the U.S. held steady in 2015 , with a $11 \%$ share of total volume of wine shipped in the direct-to-consumer wine channel.

# \$1BILLION 

 NAPA COUNTY WINERIES SURPASSED \$1 BILLION AND 50\% OF OVERALL MARKET VALUE2015 PERCENT OF TOTAL VOLUME AND VALUE BY REGION


## 2015 GROWTH IN VOLUME AND PRICE-PER-BOTTLE BY REGION



## 2015 BY WINERY REGION

|  | Volume <br> (Cases) | $\%$ of Total <br> Volume | $\pm$ in Volume | Value (USD \$) | $\%$ of Total <br> Value | $\pm$ in Value | Avg. \$/ <br> Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## REGIONALANALYSIS NAPA

2015 was a strong year for Napa Valley. This region now commands over half of the volume for the DtC industry, and it reached over $\$ 1$ billion in DtC wine sales. Napa Valley Cabernet Sauvignon shipments were largely responsible for this growth, with its $4.8 \%$ increase in average price per bottle shipped and $15.7 \%$ increase in the value of those shipments.
ance ine in value

| 2015 NAPA VARIETALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm \text { in }$ <br> Volume | Value (USD \$) |  | $\pm$ in Value | Avg. \$ / Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| Cabernet Sauvignon | 435,457 | 31.7\% | 10.4\% | \$484,409,527 | 47.8\% | 15.7\% | \$92.70 | 4.8\% |
| Blend - Red | 196,080 | 14.3\% | 24.6\% | \$186,175,725 | 18.4\% | 26.6\% | \$79.12 | 1.6\% |
| Chardonnay | 139,868 | 10.2\% | 7.1\% | \$67,379,319 | 6.7\% | 12.7\% | \$40.14 | 5.2\% |
| Pinot Noir | 106,589 | 7.8\% | 2.3\% | \$60,602,681 | 6.0\% | 8.7\% | \$47.38 | 6.2\% |
| Merlot | 62,031 | 4.5\% | -1.5\% | \$34,187,860 | 3.4\% | 2.5\% | \$45.93 | 4.0\% |
| Fume / Sauvignon / Blanc | 74,440 | 5.4\% | 13.8\% | \$27,058,980 | 2.7\% | 23.7\% | \$30.29 | 8.7\% |
| Zinfandel | 61,970 | 4.5\% | 11.1\% | \$25,328,457 | 2.5\% | 6.7\% | \$34.06 | -3.9\% |
| Sparkling | 58,603 | 4.3\% | 0.2\% | \$22,224,288 | 2.2\% | 6.2\% | \$31.60 | 6.0\% |
| Unspecified | 38,930 | 2.8\% | -14.1\% | \$19,927,434 | 2.0\% | -17.3\% | \$42.66 | -3.7\% |
| Cabernet Franc | 22,897 | 1.7\% | 17.3\% | \$16,388,636 | 1.6\% | 23.9\% | \$59.65 | 5.7\% |
| Other Red | 34,865 | 2.5\% | 18.4\% | \$14,856,938 | 1.5\% | 28.4\% | \$35.51 | 8.4\% |
| Syrah / Shiraz | 21,462 | 1.6\% | -7.3\% | \$12,261,584 | 1.2\% | 0.2\% | \$47.61 | 8.1\% |
| Petite Sirah | 18,499 | 1.3\% | -3.0\% | \$8,576,087 | 0.8\% | 2.8\% | \$38.63 | 5.9\% |
| Other White | 19,974 | 1.5\% | 3.4\% | \$7,582,782 | 0.7\% | -3.4\% | \$31.64 | -6.6\% |
| Blend - White | 21,837 | 1.6\% | 21.8\% | \$7,011,168 | 0.7\% | 12.0\% | \$26.76 | -8.0\% |
| Rose | 21,876 | 1.6\% | 20.0\% | \$6,280,550 | 0.6\% | 37.1\% | \$23.92 | 14.2\% |
| Other | 16,157 | 1.2\% | -26.4\% | \$5,475,320 | 0.5\% | -19.2\% | \$28.24 | 9.8\% |
| Sangiovese | 6,265 | 0.5\% | 16.3\% | \$2,966,498 | 0.3\% | 21.5\% | \$39.46 | 4.5\% |
| Pinot Gris / Grigio | 8,152 | 0.6\% | 2.4\% | \$1,869,677 | 0.2\% | 2.0\% | \$19.11 | -0.3\% |
| Riesling | 7,445 | 0.5\% | -1.1\% | \$1,847,853 | 0.2\% | -3.9\% | \$20.68 | -2.8\% |
| Moscato | 428 | 0.0\% | -68.6\% | \$64,585 | 0.0\% | -75.5\% | \$12.58 | -22.1\% |
| TOTAL | 1,373,825 | 100.0\% | 8.6\% | \$1.01 B | 100.0\% | 14.7\% | \$61.41 | 5.7\% |

## SONOMACOUNTY

Sonoma County experienced a 7.5\% decrease in average price per bottle shipped and a $3.5 \%$ increase in volume shipped in 2015. Sonoma Cabernet Sauvignon continued to drop, and has now decreased by almost $50 \%$ over 5 years. Though shipments are up for Syrah in this region, they didn't compensate for the $22 \%$ decrease in price for this varietal. Pinot Noir continues to strengthen in the region, as this wine maintains the area's most popular wine.

| 2015 SONOMA VARIETALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm \text { in }$ <br> Volume | Value (USD \$) | \% of Total Value | $\pm$ in Value | Avg. \$ / Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| Pinot Noir | 206,420 | 20.7\% | 7.6\% | \$114,938,028 | 33.6\% | 6.9\% | \$46.40 | -0.6\% |
| Cabernet Sauvignon | 125,394 | 12.6\% | -7.8\% | \$43,832,240 | 12.8\% | -30.4\% | \$29.13 | -24.5\% |
| Chardonnay | 127,652 | 12.8\% | 8.1\% | \$41,777,439 | 12.2\% | -8.4\% | \$27.27 | -15.3\% |
| Zinfandel | 109,767 | 11.0\% | 12.8\% | \$32,559,414 | 9.5\% | 6.2\% | \$24.72 | -5.8\% |
| Blend - Red | 79,049 | 7.9\% | -14.7\% | \$28,068,968 | 8.2\% | -5.4\% | \$29.59 | 11.0\% |
| Unspecified | 27,901 | 2.8\% | -19.9\% | \$11,658,484 | 3.4\% | -11.2\% | \$34.82 | 10.8\% |
| Other Red | 34,545 | 3.5\% | -7.6\% | \$9,956,979 | 2.9\% | 5.9\% | \$24.02 | 14.6\% |
| Sparkling | 27,066 | 2.7\% | 22.5\% | \$9,462,558 | 2.8\% | 20.4\% | \$29.13 | -1.7\% |
| Fume / Sauvignon / Blanc | 51,998 | 5.2\% | 5.7\% | \$9,107,606 | 2.7\% | -1.0\% | \$14.60 | -6.3\% |
| Syrah / Shiraz | 31,989 | 3.2\% | 9.2\% | \$8,332,911 | 2.4\% | -14.3\% | \$21.71 | -21.5\% |
| Merlot | 33,262 | 3.3\% | -11.0\% | \$6,924,523 | 2.0\% | -14.0\% | \$17.35 | -3.4\% |
| Sangiovese | 14,642 | 1.5\% | 36.4\% | \$4,544,776 | 1.3\% | 21.5\% | \$25.87 | -10.9\% |
| Petite Sirah | 22,139 | 2.2\% | 72.3\% | \$4,393,227 | 1.3\% | 40.8\% | \$16.54 | -18.3\% |
| Other White | 28,441 | 2.9\% | 2.0\% | \$3,773,064 | 1.1\% | -10.2\% | \$11.06 | -12.0\% |
| Cabernet Franc | 10,482 | 1.1\% | 55.7\% | \$2,993,920 | 0.9\% | 22.6\% | \$23.80 | -21.3\% |
| Rose | 20,392 | 2.0\% | 35.4\% | \$2,987,318 | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | \$12.21 | -25.2\% |
| Other | 7,212 | 0.7\% | 45.9\% | \$2,130,557 | 0.6\% | 40.6\% | \$24.62 | -3.6\% |
| Pinot Gris / Grigio | 18,411 | 1.8\% | 5.1\% | \$1,779,793 | 0.5\% | -22.2\% | \$8.06 | -26.0\% |
| Blend - White | 9,349 | 0.9\% | -31.9\% | \$1,609,685 | 0.5\% | -25.2\% | \$14.35 | 9.8\% |
| Riesling | 4,137 | 0.4\% | 27.8\% | \$509,437 | 0.1\% | -8.0\% | \$10.26 | -28.0\% |
| Moscato | 6,649 | 0.7\% | 41.1\% | \$367,914 | 0.1\% | 75.9\% | \$4.61 | 24.6\% |
| TOTAL | 996,897 | 100.0\% | 3.5\% | \$341,708,842 | 100.0\% | -4.3\% | \$28.56 | -7.5\% |

Oregon continues to stand out with a $13 \%$ increase in volume of wine shipped and 15\% increase in value, likely due to the region's Pinot Noir popularity. Shipments of Oregon Pinot Noir accounted for $70 \%$ of the total value of the area's DtC channel. This comes after a 54\% increase in volume and 57\% increase in the value of shipments of Oregon Pinot Noir in 2014. In just two years, the value of Oregon shipments of Pinot Noir has increased by more than 80\%, to $\$ 70$ million.
13.3\%
increase in value 13.3\%
industry volume \$40.17

|  | 2015 OREGON VARIETALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm \text { in }$ <br> Volume | Value (USD \$) | \% of Total Value | $\pm$ in Value | Avg. \$/ Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| Pinot Noir | 118,422 | 56.9\% | 13.2\% | \$70,006,900 | 69.8\% | 16.8\% | \$49.26 | 3.2\% |
| Chardonnay | 14,924 | 7.2\% | 30.8\% | \$6,135,406 | 6.1\% | 40.8\% | \$34.26 | 7.6\% |
| Blend - Red | 10,501 | 5.0\% | 22.1\% | \$3,463,065 | 3.5\% | 20.1\% | \$27.48 | -1.6\% |
| Syrah / Shiraz | 6,050 | 2.9\% | -24.9\% | \$2,910,604 | 2.9\% | -35.5\% | \$40.09 | -14.1\% |
| Pinot Gris / Grigio | 12,039 | 5.8\% | 21.3\% | \$2,910,468 | 2.9\% | 30.3\% | \$20.15 | 7.4\% |
| Sparkling | 4,904 | 2.4\% | -20.0\% | \$2,376,714 | 2.4\% | -9.6\% | \$40.39 | 13.0\% |
| Cabernet Sauvignon | 5,193 | 2.5\% | 40.3\% | \$2,129,915 | 2.1\% | 11.7\% | \$34.18 | -20.4\% |
| Unspecified | 5,386 | 2.6\% | 47.1\% | \$2,115,775 | 2.1\% | 39.4\% | \$32.73 | -5.3\% |
| Rose | 6,852 | 3.3\% | 106.5\% | \$2,001,560 | 2.0\% | 113.8\% | \$24.34 | 3.5\% |
| Riesling | 6,386 | 3.1\% | 1.5\% | \$1,609,301 | 1.6\% | 17.5\% | \$21.00 | 15.7\% |
| Other Red | 5,085 | 2.4\% | -7.2\% | \$1,312,731 | 1.3\% | -12.8\% | \$21.52 | -6.0\% |
| Other White | 3,659 | 1.8\% | -19.1\% | \$1,030,938 | 1.0\% | -2.8\% | \$23.48 | 20.1\% |
| Merlot | 3,089 | 1.5\% | 39.8\% | \$673,154 | 0.7\% | 32.6\% | \$18.16 | -5.1\% |
| Blend - White | 2,145 | 1.0\% | 10.9\% | \$447,768 | 0.4\% | -9.1\% | \$17.40 | -18.0\% |
| Other | 932 | 0.4\% | -46.2\% | \$390,617 | 0.4\% | -61.7\% | \$34.92 | -28.8\% |
| Cabernet Franc | 538 | 0.3\% | -27.8\% | \$324,484 | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | \$50.29 | 38.5\% |
| Fume / Sauvignon / Blanc | 1,168 | 0.6\% | 140.7\% | \$238,682 | 0.2\% | 138.3\% | \$17.02 | -1.0\% |
| Sangiovese | 601 | 0.3\% | 30.3\% | \$169,044 | 0.2\% | 34.6\% | \$23.42 | 3.3\% |
| Zinfandel | 140 | 0.1\% | 16.4\% | \$38,618 | 0.0\% | -12.5\% | \$22.97 | -24.8\% |
| Petite Sirah | 27 | 0.0\% | -83.3\% | \$10,913 | 0.0\% | -81.0\% | \$33.17 | 13.9\% |
| TOTAL | 208,042 | 100.0\% | 13.3\% | \$100,296,654 | 100.0\% | 14.6\% | \$40.17 | 1.1\% |

Washington's performance was normal for 2015, with an $11 \%$ increase in volume at the cost of a $5 \%$ decrease in price. Washington's Cabernet Sauvignon was significantly outpaced by shipments of Red Blend, which led to a whopping 65\% increase in the value of Red Blend shipments in 2015. Syrah experienced its only growth in Washington State, with volume shipments increasing by $7 \%$, the value of those shipments increasing by $17 \%$, and a $10 \%$ increase in average price per bottle shipped.


| 2015 WASHINGTON VARIETALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm$ in Volume | Value (USD \$) | \% of Total Value | $\begin{array}{r}  \pm \text { in } \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ | Avg. \$/ Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| Blend - Red | 42,440 | 27.6\% | 47.6\% | \$18,837,267 | 29.9\% | 64.6\% | \$36.99 | 11.6\% |
| Cabernet Sauvignon | 23,876 | 15.5\% | -13.0\% | \$13,340,135 | 21.2\% | -13.1\% | \$46.56 | -0.2\% |
| Syrah / Shiraz | 18,934 | 12.3\% | 6.8\% | \$9,357,421 | 14.9\% | 17.3\% | \$41.18 | 9.8\% |
| Other Red | 13,894 | 9.0\% | 23.4\% | \$5,550,994 | 8.8\% | 30.1\% | \$33.29 | 5.4\% |
| Unspecified | 6,374 | 4.1\% | -30.3\% | \$2,759,775 | 4.4\% | -59.8\% | \$36.08 | -42.4\% |
| Merlot | 7,627 | 5.0\% | -11.6\% | \$2,709,591 | 4.3\% | -14.5\% | \$29.60 | -3.3\% |
| Blend - White | 8,327 | 5.4\% | 125.0\% | \$1,691,536 | 2.7\% | 93.5\% | \$16.93 | -14.0\% |
| Cabernet Franc | 3,660 | 2.4\% | 34.4\% | \$1,670,006 | 2.7\% | 36.7\% | \$38.02 | 1.7\% |
| Chardonnay | 6,395 | 4.2\% | 32.8\% | \$1,423,299 | 2.3\% | 27.3\% | \$18.55 | -4.2\% |
| Riesling | 5,311 | 3.5\% | 37.6\% | \$1,168,598 | 1.9\% | 63.3\% | \$18.34 | 18.6\% |
| Other White | 4,322 | 2.8\% | 3.1\% | \$1,090,338 | 1.7\% | -2.6\% | \$21.02 | -5.6\% |
| Rose | 3,156 | 2.1\% | 14.6\% | \$755,666 | 1.2\% | 30.2\% | \$19.95 | 13.6\% |
| Fume / Sauvignon / Blanc | 2,418 | 1.6\% | -4.5\% | \$532,540 | 0.8\% | -1.6\% | \$18.36 | 3.0\% |
| Sangiovese | 1,621 | 1.1\% | 49.2\% | \$490,867 | 0.8\% | 60.9\% | \$25.23 | 7.8\% |
| Pinot Noir | 1,205 | 0.8\% | -81.4\% | \$437,367 | 0.7\% | -87.7\% | \$30.24 | -33.8\% |
| Other | 1,221 | 0.8\% | -23.9\% | \$382,237 | 0.6\% | -12.6\% | \$26.08 | 14.9\% |
| Zinfandel | 1,047 | 0.7\% | 353.0\% | \$318,213 | 0.5\% | 391.0\% | \$25.33 | 8.4\% |
| Pinot Gris / Grigio | 1,136 | 0.7\% | -33.1\% | \$201,854 | 0.3\% | -35.8\% | \$14.80 | -4.0\% |
| Sparkling | 590 | 0.4\% | 38.5\% | \$110,359 | 0.2\% | 57.0\% | \$15.58 | 13.3\% |
| Petite Sirah | 308 | 0.2\% | 283.4\% | \$98,345 | 0.2\% | 320.1\% | \$26.59 | 9.6\% |
| Moscato | 35 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | \$9,100 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | \$21.39 | 0.0\% |
| TOTAL | 153,900 | 100.0\% | 10.6\% | \$62,935,509 | 100.0\% | 4.9\% | \$34.08 | -5.2\% |

## REST OF CALIFORNIA

In 2015, the Rest of California region saw a 10\% dive in bottle price, which led to an $11 \%$ jump in volume shipped. This rise resulted in the Rest of California region overtaking Sonoma County for second place in value of wine shipped. This is despite Pinot Noir sales falling by $22 \%$ in 2015 , which historically has been the most valuable varietal of the region. Additionally, Syrah's dollar value decreased by 18\% in 2015. Red Blends carried the weight of the region with a 34\% shipment increase.
increase in value
25.5\%
industry volume

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2015 REST OF CALIFORNIA VARIETALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## THE REST OF US

The Rest of US regional category tracks direct-toconsumer wine shipments from wineries in every state save for California, Oregon, and Washington. The diversity of this category is exemplified by the $63 \%$ of volume that is either a varietal blend or an obscure, untracked wine. This region had arguably the best performance of all six regions, with its $11 \%$ increase in the volume of shipments and its 5.7\% increase in average price per bottle.

2015 REST OF US VARIETALS

|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm \text { in }$ <br> Volume | Value (USD \$) | \% of Total Value | $\begin{array}{r}  \pm \text { in } \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ | Avg. \$ / Bottle | $\pm$ in Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blend - Red | 95,367 | 20.7\% | 14.8\% | \$21,851,455 | 20.4\% | 29.3\% | \$19.09 | 12.7\% |
| Unspecified | 36,072 | 7.8\% | 23.1\% | \$10,785,942 | 10.1\% | 44.1\% | \$24.92 | 17.1\% |
| Other Red | 44,651 | 9.7\% | -5.5\% | \$9,627,127 | 9.0\% | 0.3\% | \$17.97 | 6.1\% |
| Other | 46,565 | 10.1\% | 16.0\% | \$8,791,604 | 8.2\% | 4.1\% | \$15.73 | -10.2\% |
| Blend - White | 39,673 | 8.6\% | 28.0\% | \$7,566,688 | 7.1\% | 46.6\% | \$15.89 | 14.5\% |
| Other White | 28,361 | 6.2\% | 4.5\% | \$5,533,088 | 5.2\% | 4.6\% | \$16.26 | 0.1\% |
| Chardonnay | 23,917 | 5.2\% | 4.4\% | \$5,319,840 | 5.0\% | 6.7\% | \$18.54 | 2.2\% |
| Cabernet Sauvignon | 17,828 | 3.9\% | -12.6\% | \$5,250,535 | 4.9\% | -8.2\% | \$24.54 | 5.1\% |
| Pinot Noir | 14,478 | 3.1\% | -27.1\% | \$4,431,130 | 4.1\% | -32.8\% | \$25.50 | -7.8\% |
| Merlot | 14,741 | 3.2\% | 18.4\% | \$4,173,943 | 3.9\% | 31.7\% | \$23.60 | 11.2\% |
| Riesling | 19,558 | 4.2\% | 9.0\% | \$4,090,904 | 3.8\% | 11.3\% | \$17.43 | 2.1\% |
| Syrah / Shiraz | 12,006 | 2.6\% | 49.8\% | \$3,700,821 | 3.5\% | 52.7\% | \$25.69 | 1.9\% |
| Cabernet Franc | 12,770 | 2.8\% | 18.7\% | \$3,687,935 | 3.4\% | 26.6\% | \$24.07 | 6.6\% |
| Sparkling | 12,111 | 2.6\% | 29.6\% | \$3,077,653 | 2.9\% | 35.0\% | \$21.18 | 4.2\% |
| Fume / Sauvignon / Blanc | 11,868 | 2.6\% | 76.5\% | \$2,943,403 | 2.7\% | 126.1\% | \$20.67 | 28.1\% |
| Rose | 11,372 | 2.5\% | 13.6\% | \$2,104,837 | 2.0\% | 13.8\% | \$15.42 | 0.2\% |
| Pinot Gris / Grigio | 8,151 | 1.8\% | 11.6\% | \$1,623,061 | 1.5\% | 17.6\% | \$16.59 | 5.4\% |
| Zinfandel | 6,880 | 1.5\% | -9.0\% | \$1,374,952 | 1.3\% | 4.5\% | \$16.65 | 14.8\% |
| Petite Sirah | 1,702 | 0.4\% | 156.6\% | \$663,832 | 0.6\% | 174.1\% | \$32.50 | 6.8\% |
| Sangiovese | 2,101 | 0.5\% | 28.8\% | \$555,592 | 0.5\% | 56.4\% | \$22.04 | 21.5\% |
| Moscato | 309 | 0.1\% | 10.8\% | \$43,400 | 0.0\% | 22.7\% | \$11.71 | 10.8\% |
| TOTAL | 460,482 | 100.0\% | 11.3\% | \$107,197,743 | 100.0\% | 17.7\% | \$19.40 | 5.7\% |

## SHIPMENTS BY DESTINATION

Over half of the $\$ 1.97$ billion worth of wine was shipped to five states in 2015: California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois. It's important to note, here, California continues to outpace other states, receiving $31 \%$ of the total volume of wine shipped. However, for the first time since 2012, California's growth for wine shipped, $0.7 \%$, failed to match industry growth, at 8.5\%.

In its first year as a legal DtC shipping state, Massachusetts saw $\$ 27.5$ million of wine shipped, at an average price of $\$ 41.23$, ranking 18th on the list of ship-to-states. We're expecting Massachusetts's second year to see even more of a jump, and for the state to land on the top 10 list for dollar value of shipments for 2016.
shipments that go to residents within the same state.

- Californians receive $96 \%$ of their shipments from California wineries.
- Oregonians receive $61 \%$ of their shipments from Oregon wineries.
- Washingtonians receive $47 \%$ of their shipments from Washington wineries.

When exploring what varietals were ordered from the different regions, it's evident Cabernet Sauvignon was the favorite. It's interesting to note that in California, where Cabernet Sauvignon holds the largest portion of its sales, Pinot Noir was the most commonly shipped varietal to California residents. Pinot Noir accounted for $16.9 \%$ of all shipments, versus Cabernet Sauvignon 16.2\%.

This year, we explored the percentage of state

## 2015 PERCENT OF TOTAL VOLUME BY DESTINATION STATES




## ENTER MASSACHUSETTS

In its first year as a legal DtC shipping state, Massachusetts saw $\$ 27.5$ million worth of wine shipped, at an average price of $\$ 41.23$, ranking 18th on the list of ship-to-states. We're expecting Massachusetts's second year to see even more of a jump, and for the state to land on the top 10 list for dolfar value of shipments for 2016.


|  | Volume (Cases) | \% of Total Volume | $\pm \text { in }$ <br> Volume | Value (USD \$) | \% of Total Value | $\begin{array}{r}  \pm \text { in } \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ | Avg. \$/ Bottle | $\pm$ in Price | Bottles per Capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CA | 1,321,788 | 30.8\% | 0.7\% | \$634,464,784 | 32.3\% | 2.2\% | \$40.00 | 1.4\% | 0.565 |
| TX | 386,117 | 9.0\% | 9.7\% | \$199,634,523 | 10.2\% | 12.0\% | \$43.09 | 2.0\% | 0.245 |
| NY | 266,972 | 6.2\% | 10.9\% | \$124,672,610 | 6.3\% | 7.2\% | \$38.92 | -3.3\% | 0.218 |
| FL | 249,197 | 5.8\% | 5.9\% | \$122,081,853 | 6.2\% | 9.9\% | \$40.83 | 3.7\% | 0.195 |
| IL | 187,199 | 4.4\% | 9.4\% | \$90,889,831 | 4.6\% | 7.5\% | \$40.46 | -1.8\% | 0.241 |
| WA | 186,622 | 4.4\% | 14.5\% | \$75,257,493 | 3.8\% | 7.6\% | \$33.61 | -6.1\% | 0.426 |
| VA | 142,454 | 3.3\% | 18.7\% | \$55,950,725 | 2.8\% | 15.5\% | \$32.73 | -2.7\% | 0.279 |
| CO | 143,567 | 3.3\% | 0.1\% | \$55,523,375 | 2.8\% | 2.3\% | \$32.23 | 2.2\% | 0.436 |
| OR | 108,102 | 2.5\% | 22.5\% | \$48,136,091 | 2.4\% | 22.7\% | \$37.11 | 0.2\% | 0.433 |
| GA | 97,934 | 2.3\% | 13.6\% | \$44,862,329 | 2.3\% | 10.7\% | \$38.17 | -2.6\% | 0.162 |
| NC | 77,274 | 1.8\% | 6.7\% | \$35,115,666 | 1.8\% | 11.9\% | \$37.87 | 4.9\% | 0.127 |
| OH | 82,382 | 1.9\% | 10.4\% | \$34,881,534 | 1.8\% | 0.3\% | \$35.28 | -9.2\% | 0.117 |
| NJ | 67,634 | 1.6\% | 33.9\% | \$33,956,332 | 1.7\% | 25.7\% | \$41.84 | -6.1\% | 0.123 |
| MI | 91,142 | 2.1\% | 7.8\% | \$33,439,494 | 1.7\% | 11.3\% | \$30.57 | 3.3\% | 0.151 |
| AZ | 71,579 | 1.7\% | 21.1\% | \$30,662,254 | 1.6\% | 13.7\% | \$35.70 | -6.1\% | 0.176 |
| MN | 69,981 | 1.6\% | 8.0\% | \$28,856,226 | 1.5\% | 4.4\% | \$34.36 | -3.3\% | 0.211 |
| MA | 55,485 | 1.3\% | 243.1\% | \$27,451,490 | 1.4\% | 231.4\% | \$41.23 | -3.4\% | 0.132 |
| MD | 78,071 | 1.8\% | 13.8\% | \$26,357,044 | 1.3\% | 12.4\% | \$28.13 | -1.3\% | 0.213 |
| CT | 54,848 | 1.3\% | 11.0\% | \$26,026,812 | 1.3\% | 6.0\% | \$39.54 | -4.5\% | 0.249 |
| TN | 56,863 | 1.3\% | 23.6\% | \$22,424,996 | 1.1\% | 21.5\% | \$32.86 | -1.7\% | 0.141 |
| WI | 53,668 | 1.3\% | 15.4\% | \$20,129,706 | 1.0\% | 9.1\% | \$31.26 | -5.5\% | 0.153 |
| MO | 53,067 | 1.2\% | 3.8\% | \$29,671,908 | 1.5\% | 8.5\% | \$46.59 | 4.5\% | 0.144 |
| NV | 39,434 | 0.9\% | -1.6\% | \$19,543,786 | 1.0\% | 2.3\% | \$41.30 | 4.0\% | 0.225 |
| DC | 25,416 | 0.6\% | -2.2\% | \$13,765,689 | 0.7\% | 1.7\% | \$45.13 | 4.1\% | 0.588 |
| SC | 35,164 | 0.8\% | 20.8\% | \$13,445,513 | 0.7\% | 14.9\% | \$31.86 | -4.9\% | 0.118 |
| IA | 33,831 | 0.8\% | 18.5\% | \$12,788,944 | 0.7\% | 12.1\% | \$31.50 | -5.5\% | 0.180 |
| LA | 29,176 | 0.7\% | 9.9\% | \$12,732,660 | 0.6\% | 4.3\% | \$36.37 | -5.2\% | 0.104 |
| KS | 28,931 | 0.7\% | 19.0\% | \$12,629,248 | 0.6\% | 15.9\% | \$36.38 | -2.7\% | 0.169 |
| IN | 18,474 | 0.4\% | 1.5\% | \$7,204,458 | 0.4\% | 6.6\% | \$32.50 | 5.1\% | 0.047 |
| NM | 17,912 | 0.4\% | 8.7\% | \$7,154,407 | 0.4\% | 4.2\% | \$33.28 | -4.2\% | 0.144 |
| NH | 15,757 | 0.4\% | -13.8\% | \$6,992,860 | 0.4\% | -18.6\% | \$36.98 | -5.6\% | 0.189 |
| NE | 16,704 | 0.4\% | 4.9\% | \$6,961,272 | 0.4\% | -1.2\% | \$34.73 | -5.9\% | 0.150 |
| HI | 9,072 | 0.2\% | 7.1\% | \$6,199,431 | 0.3\% | 13.8\% | \$56.94 | 6.3\% | 0.102 |
| ID | 13,000 | 0.3\% | 9.5\% | \$5,396,754 | 0.3\% | 12.8\% | \$34.60 | 3.0\% | 0.136 |
| MT | 13,902 | 0.3\% | 49.1\% | \$4,218,775 | 0.2\% | 42.8\% | \$25.29 | -4.2\% | 0.218 |
| WY | 11,432 | 0.3\% | 0.8\% | \$4,094,416 | 0.2\% | -0.3\% | \$29.85 | -1.1\% | 0.324 |
| ME | 10,906 | 0.3\% | 8.2\% | \$2,901,249 | 0.1\% | 0.9\% | \$22.17 | -6.8\% | 0.129 |
| AK | 4,952 | 0.1\% | -2.8\% | \$2,585,474 | 0.1\% | -6.5\% | \$43.51 | -3.8\% | 0.115 |
| ND | 7,830 | 0.2\% | -5.3\% | \$2,505,489 | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | \$26.66 | 5.5\% | 0.171 |
| WV | 5,239 | 0.1\% | -1.9\% | \$2,132,507 | 0.1\% | -4.5\% | \$33.92 | -2.7\% | 0.045 |
| VT | 5,611 | 0.1\% | 5.8\% | \$2,044,967 | 0.1\% | -3.3\% | \$30.37 | -8.6\% | 0.143 |
| RI | 3,686 | 0.1\% | -5.1\% | \$1,532,901 | 0.1\% | -7.3\% | \$34.66 | -2.4\% | 0.056 |
| DE | 1,985 | 0.0\% | -4.6\% | \$981,773 | 0.0\% | -9.3\% | \$41.22 | -4.9\% | 0.034 |

2015 GROWTH IN VOLUME BY DESTINATION STATE


2015 BOTTLES SHIPPED PER CAPITA BY DESTINATION STATE


## CONCLUSION

2015 saw another successful year in the direct-toconsumer shipping channel. This performance was buoyed by the opening of Massachusetts, which contributed $19 \%$ of the sales growth in the overall DtC channel.

When looking to the future of the industry it's important to note that the only remaining closed state with significant market opportunity is Pennsylvania. While it's unclear whether and when Pennsylvania will open to wine shipments, we estimate that the addition of Pennsylvania would represent a significant boost to the winery shipping channel- $\$ 100$ million in sales within the first four years.

In the near term, there are many other opportunities wineries can tap into. Millennial wine drinkers are beginning to replace Baby Boomers, and the smaller Generation X is poised to drive DtC sales over the next 5 to 10 years. These generations have very different tastes when it comes to wine and its important to understand their preferences and what that means for your business.

The fact that average household income has been flat or declining over recent years is another factor worth considering when developing a DtC strategy. DtC wine shipping is part of the luxury market and is impacted when households have less disposable income.

Finally, take note of the reality that wineries have more competition for high-end beverage spending than before. Craftbeer, spirits, andcider are beginning to impact the wine market (particularly among Millennial drinkers). However, the wine channel also continues to grow, with 450 new wineries joining the industry just last year. Most of these new wineries will look to the DtC shipping channel as a significant part of their sales and distribution strategy.

As a result of these factors, being a nimble and strategic DtC winery is critical to growing sales going forward. We aim for this report to provide the wine industry with information that not only allows wineries to compare their own DtC shipping channel performance against the rest of the industry, but also identifies opportunities for their businesses to grow.


Join the ShipCompliant team at this year's 11th annual DIRECT conference. DIRECT is one of the beverage alcohol industry's leading and most informative conferences. At this two day event you'll:

- Receive updates on recent and upcoming legislative changes, state-by-state
- Hear updates on the latest regulatory changes facing the industry
- Meet with the ShipCompliant team members
- Network with beverage alcohol industry peers and experts

For information or questions about sponsorship or exhibiting at this year's conference, reach out to Liz Watson at liz@shipcompliant.com or (303) 996-1748.

## REGISTER NOW:

## SHIPCOMPLIANT.COM/2016DIRECT

## 2016
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