
Creativity and Practicality in Developing Fragrances for Functional Products

**By Dr. John F. Goodman
Senior Director of Research & Development
The Procter & Gamble Company
Cincinnati, OH**

Although Procter & Gamble is not readily identified as being a fragrance company, fragrances are, and always have been, critically important to our overall product success. Procter & Gamble markets consumer goods worldwide, with greater than \$12 billion in annual sales. We count on fragrances in our products to keep them vital and acceptable in the minds of the consumer. In the United States alone, we market over 60 different brands. If we exclude edible and bulk products, approximately 95% of those brands utilize a perfume.

A number of those finished perfumes are purchased from outside fragrance houses; others are formulated by our own in-house perfumers. Worldwide, Procter & Gamble manufactures over 20 million pounds of in-house finished fragrances annually. If this in-house consumption is added to that which is purchased from outside, it is fair to conclude that we are one of the single largest users of fragrances in the world. This underscores Procter & Gamble's strong commitment to perfumery and we recognize that having outstanding and preferred fragrances is vital to the success of our business.

It may, on the surface, seem peculiar that someone who manages groups of scientists and

engineers should be addressing a group of artists. Perfumers are like great painters. What could we have in common? It is the subtle complexity of the fragrance art that brings us together. No science has yet been developed that can simulate the integration capabilities of the senses and the human brain. While the ear can be simulated by an electronic receiver, the coupling of the ear to the brain is necessary for the understanding of language, and is not simulatable. Similarly, while machines can take still or moving pictures, total scene analysis and recognition must be accomplished by the eyes through the brain.

Returning for a moment to our painter, it is the human eye-to-brain partnership which captures the work's beauty and singularity. For odor, of course, we use highly sensitive nose-brain interaction which I know we will be unable to simulate in the foreseeable future. Procter & Gamble and others need to effectively harness this powerful resource, to allow it to continue to flourish and expand and, in the process, produce new and improved consumer product aesthetic combinations. Indeed, as I proceed, I think it will become clear that our interests in, our opinions on, and our appreciation for great art

overlap to a significant degree. It will be the recognition and perceptive management of that overlap which will lead to achievements which will be extremely rewarding and satisfying to all of us in the future.

Fragrance—Key to Product Acceptance

So let us now examine the importance that fragrances play for some of Procter & Gamble's products. We have products where fragrance creates the crux of the product's image. A primary example of this would be Coast deodorant soap. Coast's refreshing fragrance, which is the product attribute that separates this brand from the many others in the market, provides the showering experience which many consumers prefer. Other examples are the Secret line of antiperspirant/deodorant products, and our Camay bar soap, with their feminine fragrances; Pert Shampoo with its distinctive color and fragrance combination; lemon fresh Joy with all the powerful connotations of the lemon essence.



A recent improvement was made to Gain laundry detergent, where freshness connotations are the result of a synergistic combination of cleaning science and fragrance artistry. Additionally, we use fragrance to reinforce benefits which are tactile in nature. An example of this is Downy fabric softener. Downy's "April freshness," which suggests softness, is reinforced powerfully by fragrance effects. The fragrances used in Bounce fabric softener and Bold 3 detergent also fit into this category.

Further, we can use fragrance to signal the longevity of a product benefit, such as Prell's long-lasting odor for more confidence that hair is cleaner longer. Such an opportunity is important from both consumer use and marketing points of view. We also use fragrances to neutralize malodors, as we do in Lilt Perms.

Finally, fragrance can be used to improve the total acceptance of products. A product's odor is the key to its acceptance. As we all know, if the perfume is wrong, it is usually a fatal error. The perfumes that we use in all of our products are very carefully chosen and thoroughly tested

among consumers to make sure that they are fully compatible with consumer expectations and aesthetic preferences. Testing among thousands of consumers prior to marketplace exposure is a standard practice.

Creativity and Practicality

As I previously stated, perfume development for our products is done both inside Procter & Gamble and through collaborative efforts with outside fragrance houses. Our in-house perfumers become experts on consumer needs and expectations as well as the brand images of our products. Therefore the perfumers are able to create fragrances which are both lasting and unique. Further, this familiarity allows them to make improvements to the fragrance that enable the products to stay abreast of evolutionary changes that consumers desire. It is important that outside houses also keep these brands characterizations in mind.

The task that we all face is complex. The fragrance must be consistent with the brand's image. Further, it must be not only acceptable, but preferred, and preferred across a wide range of conditions. For example, consider a perfume for a laundry additive. The fragrance must be appreciated in full-strength product, in solution in the washer, on the wet clothes as they're removed from the washer, and finally on dry laundry. Fragrance changes are made along sensory and technical lines that are the logical extensions of the basic building blocks of each perfume.

Fragrance houses are asked to submit new perfumes for selected products because we feel it is prudent to tap into the broad resources of the industry. In the past few years, our in-house perfumers, working by themselves and in collaborative efforts with perfume suppliers, have begun to actively apply an appropriate mixture of creativity and business-minded practicality to their formulation activities. The results are fragrances which are both winners among consumers and astute technical combinations for the complicated marketing world of the 1980s. It is, in my mind, key that our outside sources formulate under the same guidelines as those which we are requesting of our own perfumers.

Principles of Practicality

Why is it so important that creativity and practicality be melded into the 1980s? It's really quite simple. The number of consumers using our products is enormous and ever increasing. Further, as we and others strive to make our fra-

1982 Perfumers Symposium—Goodman

grance development program more efficient, it is likely that perfumes will be more widely used in many countries where the cultural trends are similar. What we have to avoid is disruption. If we are selling several million units of a product per day, it is not tolerable to have a supply interruption due to the presence of a fragrance material which has somehow become unacceptable and, in retrospect, is not essential to the fragrance, or is replaceable with a much less controversial material. With this type of broad usage, it becomes more and more urgent that principles of practicality be addressed. In our view, these principles are as follows:

- safety and regulatory
- cost
- availability
- quality
- stability

A disruption in any one of these areas causes companies like Procter & Gamble, and their perfumers in particular, a great deal of pain. A quick example from each one of these areas around the fictional essential essence, maruba bush oil, will help illustrate the points that are important to us.

Safety and Regulatory

We must be aware of the structure of materials which have been or are being questioned and avoid those materials and their analogs, or those with similar structures. If oil from the maruba

bush contains a large amount of a material that is similar in structure to the recently banned 2-2-DI-questionmark ad nauseam, *avoid* maruba oil. It will be even more important in the future to thoroughly chemically characterize natural source materials.

Cost

If the cost of maruba oil is increasing at 30% per year, and has been for some time, it is wise to avoid the oil. If one doesn't at the beginning, it could be the first major replacement task since in the current business environment, cost savings are becoming more and more important.

Availability

Consider the source of the materials. If the oil of the maruba bush is available only from Iffyland, it is wise to consider Iffyland's economic and political stability. It could be that Iffyland is much more of a question mark than it appears on the surface. How much better it would be if synthetic maruba oil was being economically and reliably synthesized, or new growing areas were being developed in stable environments.

Quality

If Iffyland looks to be stable and reliable, the quality of the maruba oil from bush to bush and season to season is the next source of concern. Have multiple lots been purchased and confirmed to be acceptable? What has the historical picture been, and what factors could—and likely will—radically affect future quality?

1982 ASP Symposium
Committee: (1st row)
Edita Dronovsky, Rayda
Vega (Chairwoman),
Felix Buccellato, (2nd
row) Steven Orson,
Margo Androulakis, Sue
McEwen, (3rd row) Ted
Barba, and Guido Cian-
ciolo.

Photo by C. Baude

Stability

Does maruba oil turn brown when exposed to the sun? If so, it is probably not a good ingredient for a shampoo in a clear plastic bottle which could sit on a bathroom windowsill. Does it chemically react with any of the other product ingredients or with the other fragrance ingredients? Is it stable under its usage conditions such as in hot dishwater, or in an acidic laundry load?

Consideration of all of these basic areas is still not sufficient. We are asking that our perfumers keep other things in mind. First, we would like our formulas to be as uncomplicated as possible, that is, the fewer ingredients, the better. Certainly we won't compromise fragrance quality in pursuit of this goal, but on the other hand, we would rather not have potentially controversial materials at thousandths of a percent level in the product if we really don't need them. Next, we would like the chemical species that are in each fragrance to be characterized and projected for possible positive or negative interactions with the product.



We also desire to make certain classes of fragrance chemicals work in a positive synergistic fashion with the product, because of the innate strengths of the chemistry involved. In other words, we need to add science to the art. Do the materials perform an important product function other than imparting odor? Examples of these extra benefits might include substantivity or retentiveness, perhaps to hair or fabric; ability to mask a malodor; or viscosity stabilization. Finally, we might like the fragrance to be adaptable to a number of different bases. For example, will it be capable of giving the same odor sensation when used in both a shampoo and a post-shampoo conditioner?

Long Term Creativity

If some of you are thinking that the constraints imposed by practical considerations are going to present major barriers to creative perfumers, then I think you should reconsider. As working partners in pursuit of superiority, I don't believe

we can think of it in that way. Practicality should be viewed as a challenge and an opportunity for additional creativity—creativity that is necessary for the long term.

It has worked for in-house creations, and for outside submissions where communication and cooperation have been efficiently managed. Our newest fragrances, those that have been developed under the combined guidelines of creativity and practicality, are still consumer-preferred. Moreover, the developmental timeline for the creation of these fragrances has not been significantly lengthened. As a matter of fact, in some cases, the path has actually been shortened. Practical fragrances are easier to troubleshoot. It is easier to isolate the fragrance material which is turning your soap bar brown if it's one of forty components rather than one of one hundred and forty. Indeed, the process for operating in this fashion is not more tortuous than the ones that we and others have likely followed in the past. It's just a little different. In our view, the path for the 1980s is an evolutionary creature from the 1950s and 1960s.

Another positive aspect of this practicality is that our products' fragrance costs have been trending downward. We are creating better fragrances that cost us less in raw materials. Obviously, this is a very attractive combination for anyone. When fragrance represents a significant fraction of the total product cost, cost reduction tends to get your attention.

Another thing that has been happening, and we're keeping our fingers crossed, is that we have had fewer marketplace disruptions due to the many problems which I suggested earlier, simply because we have consciously planned to avoid them from the start. As ingredients come under closer scrutiny by the regulatory agencies, we find that we may have already excluded those ingredients from our formulations. We are working to avoid the use of natural materials which have had supply or cost problems in the past. These kinds of materials are being discarded at the outset of fragrance formulation work, and are being replaced by either similar-smelling analogs or synthetic materials.

Now, I doubt if Procter & Gamble's approach is fundamentally different from others who manufacture functional products. I feel that the concepts I've presented here are ones that our competitors and companies in other categories are following now or will have to follow in the future.

Such an approach can be thought of as a new order and the 1980s way of doing things for fra-

grances for mass-marketed functional products. Our overall fragrance quality and preference objectives have not been compromised. Our very stringent criteria for presenting a fragrance in a new or an improved product will remain. In some cases, we're making the conditions for going to market even more severe. The point is that we are increasingly successful in formulating fragrances under these guidelines. In order for us to continue to be successful, these principles must be foremost in the perfumer's mind. R&D management at Procter & Gamble is making this an important part of the mission of our perfumers as they manage fragrance products.

In closing, I'd like to again allude to the analogy of perfumers as painters. Procter & Gamble continues to regard our perfumers and the perfumers of the fragrance houses as artists, and we are in no way attempting to alter the course of art. We are certainly not trying to change the painter's vision of what the final picture will be. All that we're asking is for the colors that are blended to be very carefully selected. Certainly,

if the painter runs out of a certain shade of brown, it doesn't mean that the painting is not completable, nor that blue instead of brown will be used. Rather, the painter will create the needed shade of brown. In much the same fashion, if certain materials are not appropriate for inclusion in finished fragrances due to cost, safety, or availability, it doesn't mean that the finished fragrance will be of lesser quality. It merely means that additional creativity—creativity born out of practicality—will be exercised.



Expanding the men's fragrance and grooming market has been an ongoing challenge for our industry. We have been scrutinizing men's grooming habits, secret fantasies, inner goals and ambitions in order to find more viable ways of communicating with the male consumer. The advertising community has been just as vitally concerned with pioneering new approaches for expanding men's products. Arnold Wechter, President of the advertising consultation firm Wechter Associates, will discuss some past experiences in men's advertising which we hope will give us insight for the future.

Mr. Wechter started his career in 1956 at D.K.G. Advertising Agency. In 1963 he was appointed Vice-President; in 1964 he was made a Partner. In 1966 Mr. Wechter joined Revlon, Inc. as Director of Advertising for all domestic brands. In 1967 he was appointed Director of Marketing, first for "Natural Wonder" and subsequently for "Moon Drops."

Mr. Wechter joined Della Femina, Trivisano & Partners in 1970 as a Senior Vice-President and Management Supervisor. He headed an account group that serviced such clients as Prince Matchabelli, Div. of Chesebrough-Ponds; Alexandra de Markoff, Div. of Charles of the Ritz; Vick Chemical; and the New York Mets Baseball Team. Mr. Wechter was elected a Partner in 1977 and 1978 he was appointed Executive Vice-President and General Manager of the New York office of Della Femina, Trivisano.

In September 1980, Mr. Wechter established Wechter Associates, Inc., an international business service specializing in professional counsel to foreign companies wishing to market their products in the United States. Mr. Wechter will review the "Role of Men's Fragrance Advertising in the Mating Game."

Steve Raphael of Felton, Gabe Raphael, consultant, Harry Cuttler of Florasynth, and Emanuel Poons of Novarome at the Symposium.