



Introducing the Group of 100: Corporate Giants in a Failed Food System

In 2022, as the COVID pandemic began to wind down, the world's eight largest agribusiness corporations reported more than \$1 trillion in global sales.¹ That same year, global food prices hit record highs² and nearly a billion people went hungry.³

This inequality is the product of a global food system dominated by large-scale, extractive corporations that depend on socioeconomic relations sustained by centuries of forced labor and systemic poverty. In this system, production is focused on commodities for export rather than food to feed people. Some scholars refer to our current era as “the *plantationocene*”⁴-- a time in world history where the dominant economic model is based on the massive exploitation of land and labor, with devastating consequences for the vast majority of people, billions of factory farmed animals, and all life on earth.

Despite the idea of “feeding the world” being relentlessly invoked to justify the policies and practices of the dominant food system, the industrial agribusiness system does just the opposite. It exacerbates the conditions of hunger and undermines our ability to feed future generations. By concentrating food sector profits, market control, and access to seeds and land among a handful of corporations, by generating profits based on poverty wages and low crop prices for farmers, and by putting control of the system largely in the hands of big banks and billionaire shareholders, this system disenfranchises farmers, workers and eaters across the globe.⁵ Despite its claims to innovation and efficiency, it is so concentrated,

centralized, and brittle that it deepens our vulnerability to the very environmental and social crises it helps create. The abject failures of the industrialized food system stems from the fact that it is designed to serve the continual accumulation and concentration of wealth and power over all other goals. Consider, for example, the huge swaths of rainforest that have been converted to massive oil palm plantations which ship palm oil from Malaysia to Europe for use in cosmetics, industrial lubricants, and junk food; or the vast industrial monocultures of corn and soy grown in the U.S. (in some of the most fertile soils in the world) solely to feed cows, fuel cars, and produce high-fructose corn syrup and other ingredients for unhealthy, ultra-processed foods. This complex, driven by development policies mandated by elite interests at global finance institutions, has produced profit for agribusiness corporations and their shareholders at the expense of human rights, community food security, animal welfare, local ecologies, biodiversity, and the climate.

Instead of meeting people's food needs, this system extracts wealth from land, labor, and public resources including water, forests, and taxpayer funds and funnels it to distant financial interests. For these reasons, we propose a new name for this fusion of industrial agribusiness and global finance: the **Agribusiness Financial Complex**. And, to give a picture of who dominates the system, we identify the biggest corporate players. We call them **the Group of 100**.

Consider these facts about the Agribusiness Financial Complex:

- Industrial agriculture may use as much as 70% of global agricultural land and resources, yet it feeds less than 30% of the world's population.⁶
- Just 1% of the world's largest farms now control 70% of the world's farmland.⁷
- Just four corporations control half the world's commercial seed and 60 percent of pesticide sales.⁸
- Ten firms dominate the global food and grain trade.⁹
- In most national and regional markets, just a handful of supermarkets now monopolize commercial food sales.
- Industrial agriculture is the sector that receives the largest share of government subsidies worldwide -- USD \$851 billion per year across 54 countries in 2020-2022 -- in effect transferring taxpayers' money straight to agribusiness profits.¹⁰
- Five asset managers, BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street, Fidelity, and Capital Group, own 10%-30% of shares across the entire agrifood system. The biggest asset managers, Blackrock, Vanguard, and State Street, known as "the big three," own roughly one quarter of the institutional shares in major players in the industrial food system, including Tyson, ADM, Walmart, and Kroger.¹¹
- Over one-third of the global population lives in countries that pay more to service their national debts than they do for health and education.¹² In a vicious cycle, debt drives hunger, and, because poorer governments depend on loans to pay for food imports, hunger drives more debt.¹³
- The finance industry is routinely turning agricultural resources, from land to genetic resources, into new financial asset classes for speculative investment.¹⁴












At the heart of the Agribusiness Financial Complex are the “**Group of 100**” — the 100 largest corporations of the agribusiness system (ranked by sales) that milk the system for profits against the interests of billions of farmers, workers, eaters, and a livable future. These firms span the supply chain from production to processing to retail and include companies providing chemical and machinery inputs as well as companies that produce and sell non-edible products grown on land, such as timber, textiles, tobacco, and biofuels.

The Group of 100 exert outsized influence through sheer scale. Their huge revenue streams






surpass many national budgets. Massive accumulation of capital gives these companies significant control over food supply chains and the ability to shape policy environments to their advantage. How the system functions is directly related to how much power these companies wield. Many of them are monopolistic actors within their sectors, wielding market power accumulated over a century or more — often through extractive practices rooted in colonialism, land theft, slavery, and racial capitalism. **The Group of 100 don’t just control the global industrial food system — they are the system.**

The Group of 100

This list represents the most dominant powers of an industrial agrifood system that prioritizes corporate growth and financial returns, often at the expense of public health, social equity, and the long-term sustainability of our food resources.¹⁵

NAME	TYPE	2022 REVENUE TOTAL (US\$Million)	2022 FOOD REVENUE (US\$Million)	HQ	INC. DATE	SECTOR
 Walmart	Public	\$572,754	\$305,600	USA	1945	Grocery Retail
 Cargill	Private	\$165,034	\$140,279	USA	1865	Cross Chain, Trader
 SCHWARZ	Private	\$162,330	\$118,501	Germany	1930	Grocery Retail
 Kroger	Public	\$137,888	\$114,600	USA	1883	Grocery Retail
 COSTCO WHOLESALE	Public	\$226,954	\$110,800	USA	1976	Grocery Retail
 中粮 COFCO 自然之源 粮安天下	State	\$110,357	\$101,101	China	1949	Cross Chain, Trader
 Nestlé	Public	\$99,339	\$99,339	Switzerland	1866	Food Manufacture, Drink Manufacturer
 ADM	Public	\$101,556	\$91,522	USA	1902	Trader
 ALDI	Private	\$112,200	\$89,760	Germany	1948	Grocery Retail

	Public	\$86,392	\$86,392	USA	1898	Food Manufacturer, Drink Manufacturer
	Public	\$84,151	\$84,151	USA	1886	Drink Manufacturer
	Private	\$96,040	\$79,713	France	1964	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$89,740	\$78,971	Japan	2005	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$72,731	\$72,731	Brazil	1953	Animal
	Public	\$91,522	\$72,399	Singapore	1999	Cross Chain, Trader
	Public	\$89,760	\$70,737	UK	1919	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$86,392	\$69,800	Netherlands	1867	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$84,151	\$67,554	USA	1969	Distributor
	Public	\$79,713	\$67,232	USA	1818	Trader
	Co-Op	\$78,971	\$64,700	Germany	1927	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$72,731	\$61,483	USA	1902	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$72,399	\$61,400	USA	1860	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$87,329	\$61,100	France	1959	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$59,931	\$59,931	Netherlands	1851	Trader
	Public	\$57,786	\$57,786	Belgium	1852	Drink Manufacturer
	Public	\$53,282	\$53,282	USA	1935	Animal
	Public	\$75,777	\$51,873	Japan	1858	Trader, Cross Chain
	Public	\$52,563	\$47,946	USA	1837	

	Private	\$47,000	\$47,000	USA	1891	Food Manufacturer
	Private	\$54,534	\$44,173	USA	1921	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$49,563	\$41,633	Germany	1907	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$54,901	\$40,600	Singapore	1989	Cross Chain, Trader
	Public	\$78,211	\$39,888	Japan	1758	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$132,938	\$39,881	China	1999	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$97,300	\$39,441	Thailand	1921	Animal Products: Meat & Dairy, Food Manufacturer
	Public	\$44,187	\$39,326	Australia	1924	Grocery Retail
	Co-Op	\$47,800	\$37,460	USA	1931	Cross Chain, Food Manufacturer,
	Private	\$37,075	\$37,075	Netherlands	2015	Trader, Cross Chain
	Public	\$37,012	\$37,012	Canada	2018	
	Private	\$38,631	\$35,927	Netherlands	1975	Grocery Retail
	Co-Op	\$35,650	\$35,650	Switzerland	1864	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$35,410	\$35,410	France	1898	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$35,300	\$35,300	USA	1976	Distributor
	Public	\$109,484	\$35,035	Japan	1858	Cross Chain, Trader
	Public	\$34,198	\$34,198	UK	1902	Tobacco
	Public	\$34,057	\$34,057	USA	2007	Distributor
	State	\$71,128	\$33,466	China	2004	

 中国供销合作社 CHINA CO-OP	State	\$32,833	\$32,833	China	2010	
	Public	\$32,250	\$32,250	USA	1971	Fast Food/Restaurants
 PHILIP MORRIS INTERNATIONAL	Public	\$31,762	\$31,762	USA	1902	Tobacco
	Public	\$34,876	\$31,737	Russia	1994	Grocery Retail
	State	\$31,616	\$31,616	India	1965	Distributor
	Public	\$31,496	\$31,496	USA	2000	Food Manufacturer
	Co-Op	\$37,611	\$30,687	Japan	1961	Cross Chain, Trader
 中国林业集团 CHINA FORESTRY GROUP CORPORATION	Private	\$30,555	\$30,555	China	1984	Paper and Forest Products
	Public	\$30,256	\$30,256	Netherlands	1864	Drink Manufacturer
	Private	\$34,538	\$29,703	France	1997	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$38,900	\$29,175	USA	1905	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$29,141	\$29,141	France	1899	Food Manufacturer, Drink Manufacturer
 UNFI BETTER FOOD. BETTER FUTURE.	Public	\$28,928	\$28,928	USA	1976	Distributor
	Private	\$28,600	\$28,600	France	1933	Animal
 萬洲國際 WH GROUP	Public	\$28,136	\$28,136	Hong Kong	1958	Animal
	Public	\$513,983	\$27,605	USA	1994	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$38,325	\$26,828	France	1969	Grocery Retail
 首农 SUNLON	State	\$26,819	\$26,819	China	1992	Trader
	Private	\$29,309	\$26,671	Spain	1977	Grocery Retail

	Public	\$47,194	\$26,579	USA	1885	
	Public	\$43,454	\$26,525	Germany	1863	
	Public	\$26,485	\$26,485	USA	1869	Food Manufacturer
	Public	\$34,220	\$26,247	USA	1939	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$32,660	\$25,916	UK	1941	
	Public	\$27,842	\$25,823	Australia	1914	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$25,096	\$25,056	USA	1822	Tobacco
	Public	\$41,016	\$24,659	UK	1869	Grocery Retail
	Co-Op	\$24,500	\$24,500	USA	1968	Animal
	Public	\$24,700	\$24,326	Brazil	1986	Animal
	Private	\$23,902	\$23,902	Germany	1959	
	Public	\$43,441	\$23,893	Canada	1919	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$24,120	\$23,396	Canada	1907	Grocery Retail
	Private	\$23,300	\$23,300	USA	1918	Distributor
	Public	\$63,287	\$22,952	UK	1860	Food Manufacturer
	Public	\$26,743	\$22,732	Portugal	1792	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$32,255	\$22,579	Germany	1964	Grocery Retail
	Public	\$104,713	\$22,400	Japan	1947	Trader, Cross Chain
	Public	\$22,348	\$22,348	South Korea	1953	Food Manufacturer

 IMPERIAL BRANDS	Public	\$21,644	\$21,644	UK	1636	Tobacco
 WestRock	Private	\$21,257	\$21,257	USA	2015	Paper and Forest Products
 emart	Public	\$22,769	\$21,175	South Korea	1993	Grocery Retail
 International Paper	Public	\$21,161	\$21,161	USA	1898	Paper and Forest Products
 ASDA	Private	\$30,269	\$20,995	UK	1965	Grocery Retail
 McDonald's	Public	\$23,183	\$20,865	USA	1940	Fast Food/Restaurants
 DIAGEO	Public	\$20,516	\$20,516	UK	1886	Drink Manufacturer
 MOUTAI	Public	\$20,312	\$20,312	China	1951	Drink Manufacturer
 sodexo	Public	\$21,125	\$20,263	France	1966	
 CONAD	Co-Op	\$19,970	\$19,970	Italy	1962	Grocery Retail
 GRUPO BIMBO	Public	\$19,827	\$19,827	Mexico	1945	Food Manufacturer
 JTI	Public	\$20,344	\$19,697	Japan	1985	Tobacco
 NEW HOPE GROUP	Private	\$21,062	\$19,482	Australia	1982	Animal
 LAND O LAKES	Co-Op	\$19,226	\$19,226	USA	1921	Animal
 Asahi	Public	\$19,748	\$19,156	Japan	1889	Food Manufacturer, Drink Manufacturer

Size Matters

The Group of 100 collectively amassed approximately \$4.5 trillion USD in agrifood-related revenue in 2022 -- roughly equivalent to the International Energy Agency's estimate of the investment needed to transition to clean energy by 2030.¹⁶ Each of the Group of 100 exceeded \$19 billion USD in agrifood sales in 2022, a figure larger than the national budgets of many middle-income countries.¹⁷

Geography Matters

Although they operate globally, the Group of 100 are overwhelmingly headquartered in the Global North. One-third (34) are based in the United States (the largest country of origin) followed by eight each in France, the United Kingdom, and Japan, and seven each in Germany and China. The dominance of U.S.-based firms is unsurprising given the country's role in exporting the industrial agrifood model, but it remains striking. The geographic concentration in G7 countries reflects a sustained and historically rooted imbalance in global power over food systems that were often built on colonial and extractive systems. This imbalance is even more significant considering that roughly 75% of global agricultural production occurs in the Global South.¹⁸

Power at the Top Matters

What the list shows is that financial power, extracted from the Earth, is funneled upwards through global value chains to line the pockets of those furthest removed from Earth's life-giving abundance. ***While there are harms caused at every link in the industrial food chain, it is the handful of conglomerates that produce, trade and control the market for industrially produced meat and dairy, commodity crops, seeds, and agrochemicals that do the most direct harm due to practices that are immensely extractive in both ecological and economic terms.*** But the entire complex matters.

More than one-third (37) of the Group of 100 companies do not produce food – they ship it and sell it in supermarkets, convenience stores and wholesale outlets. That grocery retailers top the list by revenue is unsurprising given their position at the end of the value chain. The high revenue accumulation of major grocery retail conglomerates is particularly notable in an era of rising food prices and food insecurity.

But, while retail companies lead the list in revenue, their profit margins pale in comparison to the largest meat corporations and major food manufacturers, which rake in even higher profits -- in some cases up to 300% net profit -- by exerting concentrated market power that allows them to control production and supply chains. The Group of 100 list includes 12 food manufacturers (companies that process ingredients into packaged foods), nine beverage producers (five of which are alcohol companies), and nine animal product firms (six in meat, four in dairy – with some overlap). Three companies operate catering or food service, providing prepared foods to hotels, sports arenas, hospitals and other institutions. These include Sodexo and Compass Group, two of the three largest public school food operators (K-12) in the U.S. Two of the Group of 100, Starbucks and McDonald's, are fast food giants. Six companies are food distributors. One company – Deere & Co. – produces agricultural machinery.

Six Group of 100 firms are seed and agrichemical companies; five of these manufacture and sell pesticides along with chemical-coated and/or genetically modified seeds, and four also manufacture fertilizers. Thirteen are wholesale traders of commodities like grains and oilseeds – the second largest sector category after grocery retailers. These include the “ABCDs of Agribusiness”: Archer Daniels Midland, Bunge, Cargill, COFCO, and Louis Dreyfus. These traders have immense sway over global commodity markets.

Our broad definition for the Group of 100 includes five tobacco companies and three paper/forest product firms. Ten companies on the list span multiple core sectors in the agrifood chain. Importantly, with the exception of seed production (largely tied to chemical inputs), none of the Group of 100 companies generate primary revenue from crop cultivation. This is particularly noteworthy given the failure of the current system to adequately support farmer livelihoods or community food security, and it underscores a core contradiction in the system: ***while large corporations profit from processing, trading, and selling food, farmers – the foundation of food production – face hunger and economic precarity.***

History Matters

Global companies have controlled power in the food system for centuries, starting with the British and Dutch East India companies in the 1600s. The Group of 100 can and should be viewed through the lens of history: many of the top companies were founded in the 19th or early 20th century, with links to the legacy of extractive colonial trade. All of the top ten Group of 100 companies were founded in or before 1945, with four dating back to the 1800s.¹⁹ Thirty Group of 100 companies originated in the 19th century; a few trace roots as far back as the 1600s or 1700s. These legacies matter. These companies gained power not through free-market superiority but through structural advantage, some including legacies of colonial extraction, labor violations, and land theft. The scale of these companies is not the result of their 'better' market behavior, but their historic privileged access to capital that allowed them to buy out competition and gain market power through strategic mergers and acquisitions.²⁰ Today, farmers and other smaller food system actors are increasingly hemmed in by the actions of dominant industrial superpowers like the Group of 100, limiting their choices of how to produce, process, and market their products and restricting their ability to pursue sustainable, just, or economically viable alternatives. In this sense, the system is little different — and far more powerful — than it was during the early centuries of conquest and colonization.

Policy Matters

The public provides over USD \$1 million every minute to subsidize mostly harmful industrial food systems.²¹ Similarly, well over 95% of funds for research and development in the food and farm sector go to industrial agriculture, with a pittance going to agroecology,²² and even less going to community and farmer-led innovations. This is no accident. In 2024, agribusiness groups spent more than \$179 billion lobbying the U.S. government, largely for policies that favor corporate interests.²³

The same dynamic holds in finance: through financialization, the provision of public goods and services has become increasingly reliant on private investment and private for-profit companies owned by, and indebted to, private financial actors — and food is no exception.²⁴ In 2024 the U.S. financial sector spent nearly \$350

billion in lobbying expenses,²⁵ and has worked relentlessly to remove regulatory constraints while simultaneously making states and the public dependent on increasingly obscure financial instruments.

What We Do Matters! Opportunities for Action

The Group of 100 shines a partial but powerful light on the beneficiaries of the industrial agrifood system. **Ultimately, the Group of 100 companies are driven by financial power, and that power can be redirected. Individuals, investors, philanthropic foundations, governments, pensioners, universities, and other institutions can influence the capital flows that feed the Group of 100.** By identifying who these companies are, how they operate, and who profits, we can design strategies to stop funding the destructive practices of industrial agribusiness financial complex and invest in systems that center food sovereignty and agroecology. Collectively, eaters, workers, activists, and everyone can take steps to transform our food systems. We can:

- **Delegitimize the industrial agribusiness financial complex:** Expose its frailties, harms, and failures and reject its credibility, authority, and social license to shape policy and capture resources.
- **Defund extractive agribusiness:** Limit public, private, and philanthropic financial support via a range of advocacy efforts already underway, including boycott and divestment campaigns, changing tax and subsidy regimes, blocking loans, and similar tactics, in order to reduce harms to people and the environment.
- **Definancialize our food systems:** Remove the influence of speculative finance and extractive investment from food and land systems and reshape policies to steer resources away from serving financial actors towards serving the public good.
- **Refund and repair:** With our food dollars, our retirement savings, our bank accounts, our voices, and our votes, we can redirect resources to invest in just, agroecological, and sovereign food systems, reparative justice, and ecological stewardship for the common good.

Endnotes

- 1 Friends of the Earth.2025. Methodology for the Group of 100 Data Collection and Analysis
- 2 Associated Press. “Global food prices hit record highs in 2022 amid drought and war.” *Associated Press*, January 2, 2023. <https://www.npr.org/2023/01/07/1147660525/global-food-prices-2022-record-high>
- 3 <https://www.who.int/news/item/24-07-2024-hunger-numbers-stubbornly-high-for-three-consecutive-years-as-global-crises-deepen--un-report>
- 4 Haraway, Donna. 2015. “Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin.” *Environmental Humanities* 6, no. 1: 159-165.
- 5 McIntyre, Beverly & Herren, Hans & Wakhungu, Judi & Watson, Robert. (2009). *Agriculture at a Crossroads: The Global Report*.
- 6 The 70/30 statistic was first asserted by ETC Group in the report, *Who Will Feed Us? Questions about the Food and Climate Crisis*. 2009. Available online: <https://www.etcgroup.org/content/who-will-feed-us>. It has been widely used and robustly debated in food policy literature. ETC Group provided further defense in the report, *Small Scale Farmers and Peasants Still Feed the World*. 2022. Available online: <https://www.etcgroup.org/content/backgrounder-small-scale-farmers-and-peasants-still-feed-world>. The statistics were most recently further examined by Knezevic, Irena & Blay-Palmer, Alison & Clause, Courtney. *Recalibrating Data on Farm Productivity: Why We Need Small Farms for Food Security*. 2023. *Sustainability*. 15(19), 14479; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151914479>. Knezevic and Palmer came up with a different land figure - they reinterpreted existing food production data to calculate that family farmers and smallholders account for 81% of food supply in kilocalories on 72% of the agricultural land while larger farms account for 13% of food supply yet use 28% of the land. They also calculated that farms over 1,000 hectares occupy 12% of the land used for food production and yet only provide 3% of the food supply in kilocalories. But they acknowledge that their calculations don't account for non-farm food production such as fishing, hunting and gathering and urban production as well as subsistence production, all of which ETC Group accounted in their original estimate.
- 7 Lowder, Sarah K., Marco V. Sánchez, and Raffaele Bertini. “Farms, family farms, farmland distribution and farm labour: What do we know today?.” (2019).
- 8 ETC Group (2022) *Food Barons 2022: Crisis Profiteering, Digitalization, and Shifting Power*. Full report available via: <https://www.etcgroup.org/content/food-barons-2022>.
- 9 https://www.etcgroup.org/files/files/06_agricultural_commodity.pdf
- 10 OECD advises countries to redirect public subsidies and other support for agriculture to innovation | OECD
- 11 Hunter BM, McCoy D, Cordilha AC, Marriott A, Roy V, Stein F, and Wood B (2025). *Private Financial Actors and Financialisation in Global Health*. United Nations University International Institute for Global Health, Kuala Lumpur.
- 12 <https://unctad.org/publication/world-of-debt>
- 13 IPES-Food, 2023. *Breaking the cycle of unsustainable food systems, hunger, and debt*.
- 14 <https://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/IMF-and-World-Bank-role-in-financialisation-of-food-and-agriculture-At-Issue-Spring-2020.pdf>
- 15 Friends of the Earth.2025. Methodology for the Group of 100 Data Collection and Analysis
- 16 <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2023/09/iea-clean-energy-investment-global-warming/>
- 17 https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/rankings/government_spending_dollars/1000/
- 18 <https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2024/september/global-changes-in-agricultural-production-productivity-and-resource-use-over-six-decades>
- 19 Cargill was founded in 1865, the Kroger Company was founded in 1883, Nestlé was founded in 1866, and PepsiCo was founded in 1898. These companies represent numbers 1, 4, 7 and 10 of the GH list by 2022 agrifood revenue, respectively.
- 20 Clapp, Jennifer, 2025, *Titans of Industrial Agriculture: How a Few Giant Corporations Came to Dominate the Farm Sector and Why It Matters*, MIT Press
- 21 Damania, Richard & Polasky, Stephen & Ruckelshaus, Mary & Russ, Jason & Amann, Markus & Chaplin-Kramer, Rebecca & Gerber, James & Hawthorne, Peter & Heger, Martin & Mamun, Saleh & Ruta, Giovanni & Schmitt, Rafael & Smith, Jeffrey & Vogl, Adrian & Wagner, Fabian & Zaveri, Esha. (2023). *Nature's Frontiers: Achieving Sustainability, Efficiency, and Prosperity with Natural Capital*. 10.1596/978-1-4648-1923-0.
- 22 Pimbert, M. Financing agroecological transformations for territorial agri-food systems: Beyond the myth of financial scarcity, *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* (2025) 13 (1): 00026. <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2025.00026>
- 23 Agribusiness Lobbying Profile • OpenSecrets: <https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying/sectors/summary?id=A>
- 24 World Wealth Report 2016, Capgemini
- 25 <https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying/sectors/summary?id=F>