



Dorota Sienkiewicz

Choice 1

Introduction

Thank you for taking part in this survey on the implementation of the Tobacco Products Directive. Please consider the following information before completing the survey:

- It will take approximately 30-60 minutes to complete depending on your familiarity and involvement with the Directive.
- For each of the open-ended answer questions, there is a **maximum limit of 3000 characters (approx. 500 words)** per answer.
- Each link used to access the survey is unique, and can only be used to complete the survey once.

Background

ICF is currently undertaking a study on Directive 2014/40/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 (hereinafter TPD) on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products and repealing Directive 2001/37/EC (revised Tobacco Products Directive) on behalf of the Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety of the European Commission (DG SANTE).

The survey is specific to the TPD and requires understanding of its contents and implementation. For reference, [click here](#) to access an online version of the TPD.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine the practical application of Directive 2014/40/EU and its specific provisions, which strengthened existing rules on how tobacco products are manufactured, produced and presented in the EU, and introduced new rules for certain tobacco-related products. The study will assess the level of implementation of the TPD by exploring both achievements and hindering factors.

In particular, the study aims to:

- Assess its implementation and levels of compliance: exploring the achievements and successes of the revised Directive, as well as obstacles

- and shortcomings encountered by various stakeholders (Member States, Civil Society Organisations, health experts, and economic operators);
- Generate evidence (through primary and secondary data collection) - in particular on the inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts of the TPD, with the aim to assess its overall relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU-added value.

The study will be used by the European Commission for the preparation of its report on the application of the TPD, required by Article 28 of the Directive.

The purpose of the consultation is to collect information and gather views from Civil Society Organisations, Health Experts, and organisations representing users with knowledge on the Directive and how it is being implemented. If you have any questions with regard to the study, please do not hesitate to contact the project manager of the study: Christina Dziejewska-Stringer, TPDassessment@icf.com.

The information you supply to the research team will be treated in the strictest confidence and individual responses will not be shared with anyone outside of the research team. The data will be anonymised and will only be presented in an aggregated manner. All the data gathered in this survey will be stored by ICF in compliance with the [European Commission's legal and data protection notices](#) and the [ICF Privacy Statement](#).

Section A: Stakeholder Profile

The first few questions ask about your involvement with the market for tobacco and related products

Please state your **first name**:

Dorota

Please state your **last name**:

Sienkiewicz

Please state your organisation:

EuroHealthNet

If you have an email you prefer to use other than the one we contacted you with, please enter it here:

d.sienkiewicz@eurohealthnet.eu

Which of the following best describes your involvement with the market for tobacco and related products?

Civil society organisation (e.g. an NGO working in the tobacco or health related sector)

Thank you for your interest in participating.

This online survey is for **civil society organisations, health experts, and organisations representing users (of tobacco and related products)** with knowledge related to the TPD. If you do not fall into one of these groups, and

rather represent a Member State or economic operator, there are separate questionnaires for those groups. Please email TPDassessment@icf.com for more information about how to participate.

If you are representing a civil society organisation, a health expert, or from an organisation representing users (of tobacco and related products) and have entered this page by mistake please click "back" and select your appropriate affiliation.

In which Member State(s) is your organisation active? **Please select all that apply.**

Austria

Belgium

Bulgaria

Denmark

Finland

France

Germany

Greece

Hungary

Ireland

Italy

Latvia

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Malta

Netherlands

Poland

Portugal

Romania

Slovakia

Slovenia

Spain

Sweden

Other: United Kingdom

The revised Tobacco Product Directive 2014/40/EU (hereafter referred to as the TPD) was introduced in 2014. The TPD regulates the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products in the EU. The TPD aims to improve the functioning of the internal market for tobacco and related products, while ensuring a high level of health protection for European citizens. The revision of the TPD accounts among other things for novel tobacco products, as well as flavourings and e-cigarettes.

How familiar are you with the TPD?

Somewhat familiar

Thank you for your interest in participating. This online survey is for **civil society organisations, health experts, and organisations representing users (of tobacco and related products)**, who are active and knowledgeable about the TPD and its implementation.

If you are knowledgeable with the TPD and have arrived at this page by mistake, please click the "back" button.

If you have any questions about the survey please contact TPDassessment@icf.com

Section B: Effectiveness

The next set of questions asks about your views on how successful the TPD has been in achieving or supporting progress towards its objectives, including facilitating the smooth functioning of the internal market and ensuring a high level of human health protection, since it entered into force on 19 May 2014. This is specifically in relation to:

- Definitions (Article 2)
- Maximum emission levels and related measurement methods (Articles 3-4)
- Reporting of ingredients (Article 5)
- Priority list of additives (Article 6)
- Regulation of ingredients (Article 7)
- Labelling and packaging provisions (Articles 8-14)
- Prohibition of tobacco for oral use (Article 17)
- Cross-border distance sales of tobacco products (Article 18)
- Novel tobacco products (Article 19)
- E-cigarettes (Article 20)
- Herbal tobacco products (Articles 21 & 22)
- Enforcement (Articles 23 & 24)

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the provisions in the TPD are clear regarding the transposition requirements?

Definitions (Article 2)	Strongly disagree
Maximum emission levels and related measurement methods (Articles 3-4)	Somewhat disagree
Reporting of ingredients (Article 5)	Somewhat disagree
Priority list of additives (Article 6)	Somewhat disagree
Regulation of ingredients (Article 7)	Somewhat disagree
Labelling and packaging provisions (Articles 8-14)	Somewhat agree
Traceability and security features (Articles 15 & 16)	Somewhat disagree
Prohibition of tobacco for oral use (Article 17)	Somewhat agree
Cross-border distance sales of tobacco products (Article 18)	Strongly disagree

Novel tobacco products (Article 19)	Strongly disagree
E-cigarettes (Article 20)	Somewhat disagree
Herbal tobacco products (Articles 21 & 22)	Don't know
Enforcement (Articles 23 & 24)	Somewhat disagree

Please elaborate on the articles which you think are the least clear (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Art.2 - Some definitions are unclear in practice, such as 'novel tobacco products' or 'e-cigarettes' by reference to smokeless tobacco or tobacco products for smoking. Definition of 'young people' should be established. Art.3-4 - There is a diverging approach across the EU regarding measurement methods of emissions used; international standards should be able to evolve with the scientific and technological developments. Art.5 - As regards ingredients, it is unclear whether MS could regulate other ingredients in e-cigarettes than flavours. Lack of clarity regarding provisions for ingredients, esp. when regulating other tobacco products. Unclear whether MS may require manufacturers/importers to carry out studies as may be prescribed by the competent authorities in order to assess the effects of ingredients on health, taking into account, their addictiveness and toxicity – before or after placing a product on a market. Unclear definition of 'young people' in ref. to internal/external studies on market research and preferences of various consumer groups. Other categories may be considered – esp. gender. Art.6 - Unclear to what extent the priority list of additives could be applicable to other tobacco products than cigarettes, esp. 'novel tobacco products' and 'e-cigarettes' Art.19 – Notification of 'novel tobacco products' should better define 'young people' category and include other characteristic relevant to defining target consumers (esp. gender). Manufacturers/importers submitting a notification are required to provide in toxicity, addictiveness and attractiveness reports, and market research on the preferences of various consumer groups. Other available and relevant information, incl. a risk/benefit analysis of the product, its expected effects on cessation of tobacco consumption, its expected effects on initiation of tobacco consumption and predicted consumer perception must be provided. To ensure comprehensiveness and independent evaluation, MS and competent authorities may require these reports to be peer reviewed by an independent scientific body, esp. regarding their comprehensiveness, methodology and conclusions. The information received shall assist EC and MS in taking the decisions pursuant to Art.7. MS and EC may charge manufacturers/importers of 'novel tobacco products' proportionate fees for those peer reviews. Information about 'commercial communication' with an aim of consumption promotion in printed, TV, radio and digital media is needed. Art.20 - Some aspects related to e-cigarettes are unclear, such as the extent to which a ban on flavours is permitted as well as the regulation of these products as medicinal products. The 'Young people' category should be defined. Info about 'commercial communication' for this product category should be updated with digital dimension. Manufacturers/importers should be required to issue similar reports as in Art.19, incl. on risk/benefit analysis. Regulate nicotine-free e-cigarettes.

In your opinion, is the TPD effectively achieving its objective of ensuring a high level of protection of human health, especially for young people (e.g. increased awareness of the harmfulness of products; decreased smoking rates)?

To a limited extent

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Despite progress made the number of smokers in the EU is still high – 26% of the overall population and 29% of young Europeans aged 15-24 smoke. Rates of smoking among (young) females have not been falling urgently as needed, with an increase in occasional smoking and uptake of novel tobacco products consumption. As 56% of smokers start before the age of 18 and 93% before the age of 25, it is essential to prevent young people from taking up tobacco use. TPD has changed EU tobacco control to a significant extent, but there is room for improvement, notably in the area of plain packaging, novel tobacco products and e-cigarettes and their taxation, in particular for the new generation of smokers (young people, females). The EU has legal competences to ensure a high level of public health in the EU internal market, including placement, presentation, content and pricing of tobacco and novel products. Considering levels of cross border trade in tobacco and related products (and novel products most recently) and diverging national legislation (e.g. on smoke-free public spaces), EU-wide rules protecting consumers' rights and health are increasingly necessary. Achieving TPD's objective of ensuring a high level of protection of human health, especially for young people, has been undermined by inconsistencies across the applicable legislative acts exploited by tobacco and related industries, in particular by aggressive commercial tactics for new products and stagnation of price increases. Increases in e-cigarette use are widely predicted as availability and publicity multiply, especially in new users; it is necessary to adequately address novel products through

regulation and taxation alongside conventional tobacco products. Given the frequent presentation of such products as a 'healthier' or 'safer' alternative to traditional tobacco products, we strongly urge caution in their active promotion. Until more evidence for the safety of e-cigarettes is presented through rigorous independent reviews, it is prudent to consider them as a potentially harmful and addictive products, to be regulated and taxed in an equivalent manner to conventional cigarettes. Reducing tobacco use among existing consumers and preventing take up by young people are important objectives towards a tobacco-free Europe. Tobacco cessation services which include qualified clinician-led, -monitored and -evaluated use of novel products have a limited place in such strategies, as do improved health literacy and health education as part of wider health promotion approaches. However, insufficiently regulated open markets in this respect are potentially harmful, not least in perpetuating sustainability of multinational corporations also selling harmful tobacco products, benefiting from exploiting vulnerability and inequalities.

In your opinion, is the TPD effectively achieving its objective of facilitating the functioning of the internal market for tobacco and related products?

To a limited extent

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

While not achieving political majority in 2014, public debates stimulated some Member States to move forward in introducing and implementing plain packaging. Since, substantial evidence and evaluative studies have emerged which can allow political agreement at EU level to ensure the smooth functioning of the internal market and offer equal protection for all EU citizens: plain packaging should be made mandatory. A big obstacle to the functioning of the internal market has been created by prohibiting the online sale of ('novel') tobacco products only in some Member States. Another obstacle is the lack of legal clarity and a proper regulatory system for the novel tobacco products, which resulted in different Member States applying different interpretations and rules for the same products, which vary from effectively banning the placing on the market of these products in some countries, to very weak rules (similar to consumer products). This also creates different standards of health protection across countries, undermining the health objective of the Directive. Last but not least, as stated in our response to the 2018 public consultation on Excise duties applied to manufactured tobacco and the possible taxation of novel products, commercial aspects of 'traditional' tobacco products should be further strengthened (prices) or introduced for 'novel tobacco products' and 'e-cigarettes', esp. concerning aggressive targeting on a new generation of smokers (young people, females).

In your opinion, has the TPD changed or contributed to changing tobacco and related product use in young people (under 25 years old) in the EU?

It has increased for some products but decreased for other products

Please elaborate and specify the type of product you are referring to as far as possible (max 500 words/3000 characters):

The TPD contributed to decreasing rates of tobacco consumption across the EU, particularly traditional tobacco products such as cigarettes. However, due to the lack of proper rules for 'novel tobacco products' (such as 'e-cigarettes' and heated tobacco), inconsistencies across different national laws and the tobacco industry's aggressive marketing of new products to young people, consumption rates for these products among youth increased. Evidence included in the 2017 Eurobarometer on attitudes of European people toward tobacco and electronic cigarettes shows that dual use of those products is quite wide-spread, and that novel tobacco products help full tobacco cessation only to a limited extent if at all. 5% of Europeans actually increased their tobacco consumption by uptake of the novel products.

In the Member States you or your organisation are familiar with, to what extent have Member States implemented the TPD provisions in the same way?

Definitions (Article 2)	Not at all similar
Maximum emission levels and related measurement methods (Articles 3-4)	Don't know
Reporting of ingredients (Article 5)	Don't know
Priority list of additives (Article 6)	Don't know
Regulation of ingredients (Article 7)	Don't know
Labelling and packaging provisions (Articles 8-14)	Somewhat similar

Traceability and security features (Articles 15 & 16)	Don't know
Prohibition of tobacco for oral use (Article 17)	Somewhat similar
Cross-border distance sales of tobacco products (Article 18)	Not at all similar
Novel tobacco products (Article 19)	Not at all similar
E-cigarettes (Article 20)	Not at all similar
Herbal tobacco products (Articles 21 & 22)	Don't know
Enforcement (Articles 23 & 24)	Not very similar

You said that one or more TPD provisions have not been implemented similarly across Member States. Please could you elaborate on how the implementation of the provisions differ, specifying the Article and Member States. Please elaborate on examples of non-consistence observed (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Differences in implementation of TPD's definitions across MS have mostly arisen in relation to the novel tobacco products. Labelling and packaging provisions (Art.8-14) have been implemented in very similar ways across MS, but some MS have implemented plain packaging (Art.24) in different ways, while others haven't implemented at all such measures. Most MS with the exception of Sweden have implemented the prohibition of tobacco for oral use in the same way. The cross-border/online distance sales of tobacco products provisions have been implemented in very different ways across MS. Regulation of e-cigarettes varies across MS regarding several aspects such as flavours, advertising, age legibility, classification (consumer vs medical product). Art.24 applied differently: plain packaging, measures going beyond the TPD.

In your opinion, is the current TPD effectively meeting WHO FCTC obligations?

To a limited extent

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

FCTC's Articles 11 and 13 and the related Guidelines have been implemented to a limited extent in the EU legislation through the TPD and the TAD, therefore some of the obligations contained in these Articles have not been effectively met. Still allowing price marked packs is non-compliant. Plain packaging can eliminate that loophole. As regards Articles 9 and 10, there is a need for a greater flexibility in the regulation of ingredients, in order to better respond to scientific and technological developments. The TPD measures implement Art. 9-10 partial guidelines. Guidance allows for Parties to go beyond. There is a need for regulations on nicotine-free cigarettes, which are currently not included and have not control on the contents. Art. 5.3 obligations have been poorly implemented in the EU (as per EU Ombudsman decision), and there is no mention of it in any of the tobacco control laws. Art. 8 has only been implemented at national level, but there is some room for EU action as regards aspects with an EU dimension (such as airport/train terminals etc.).

Section B: Relevance

Thank you for completing the first section. For the next set of questions, we would like to ask you about the extent to which the TPD and its objectives are still relevant and meeting needs, considering scientific, technical and epidemiological developments. We are interested in if the TPD is flexible and has the capacity to evolve to withstand developments in the sector.

Which of the following provisions, if any, do you think remain relevant to address current developments in the tobacco and related industries including technological, scientific, or market developments?

Definitions (Article 2)

This provision has **not** remained relevant

Maximum emission levels and related measurement methods (Articles 3-4)	This provision has not remained relevant
Reporting of ingredients (Article 5)	This provision has not remained relevant
Priority list of additives (Article 6)	This provision has not remained relevant
Regulation of ingredients (Article 7)	This provision has not remained relevant
Labelling and packaging provisions (Articles 8-14)	This provision has not remained relevant
Traceability and security features (Articles 15 & 16)	This provision has not remained relevant
Prohibition of tobacco for oral use (Article 17)	This provision has remained relevant
Cross border distance sales of tobacco products (Article 18)	This provision has not remained relevant
Novel tobacco products (Article 19)	This provision has not remained relevant
E-cigarettes (Article 20)	This provision has not remained relevant
Herbal tobacco products (Articles 21 & 22)	Don't know
Enforcement (Articles 23 & 24)	This provision has not remained relevant

Please elaborate ((max 500 words/3000 characters):

Definitions need to be adapted, particularly for novel tobacco products, 'young people' as consumers, and the coherence with definitions across tobacco control laws at EU level should be ensured. In line with the current disagreement between MS and the latest related evidence, the maximum emission levels and measurement measure should be reassessed. Provisions regarding ingredients and additives should be more clear, consistent and should provide MS with the clear possibility of adopting stricter measures. Labelling and packaging provisions should respond to the need to better protect public health, in line with the most recent evidence and raise the standard of protection by enhanced measures (85% health warnings). Cross border distances sales of tobacco products undermines the functioning of the internal market, the public health policies and the fiscal policies across the EU and should be prohibited. Novel tobacco products are no longer novel and therefore new provisions should ensure the similar treatment for all tobacco products, close existing loopholes (advertising and sponsorship of these products) and ensure consistencies with other Directives. It should also be clearly stated whether new products such as heated tobacco products should be considered tobacco products for smoking or not, in order to have a uniform set of rules across EU MS. It should also be considered that the current smoking rates take into account daily users and not occasional users, which is often a case for novel tobacco products and young people.

To what extent do you think the TPD addresses new developments in the following tobacco and related industries?

E-cigarettes	Not at all
Cigars and cigarillos	Don't know
Heated tobacco products	Not at all
Herbal products	Don't know
Cross-border online distance sales	Not at all

Other products containing nicotine Not at all

Other - please specify (optional) Don't know

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

E-cigarettes without nicotine and non-tobacco nicotine pouches. Ingredients and additives provisions should also be applicable to novel tobacco products, especially as regards flavours. MS should be able to prohibit flavours in other tobacco related products.

Are you aware of any products which are currently on the market which are **not compliant** with any of the following provisions?

Maximum emission levels (Articles 3-4)	Don't know
Characterising flavours for cigarettes and rolling tobacco (Article 7(1-5))	Don't know
Containing prohibited additives (vitamins, caffeine, smoke colourants, etc) or design features (Article 7(6-9))	Don't know
Labelling and packaging provisions (Articles 8-14)	Don't know
Traceability and security features (Articles 15 & 16)	Don't know
Tobacco for oral use (Article 17)	Don't know
Provisions on cross-border distance sales (Article 18)	Don't know
Provisions on novel tobacco products (Article 19)	Don't know
Provisions on e-cigarettes (Article 20)	Don't know
Provisions on herbal tobacco products (Articles 21 & 22)	Don't know

Section B: Coherence

We just have a few more questions for you! For the next set of questions, we are interested in your thoughts on the extent to which the TPD is still coherent and consistent internally, i.e. with its own provisions, as well as with other relevant EU and international legislation that is linked to the TPD.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the TPD provisions are coherent with each other? *In other words, do you agree or disagree that the provisions fit together and are consistent with each other?*

Somewhat disagree

Please elaborate, providing examples of coherent/incoherent provisions (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Issues of consistency for the regulation of novel tobacco products in the TPD.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the provisions of the TPD are coherent with national rules within the Member States that you are familiar with other than the ones directly implementing the Directive? *In other words, do you agree or disagree that the TPD provisions fit together and are consistent with national rules in the Member States you are familiar with, such as rules on smoke-free environments or advertising.*

Somewhat disagree

Please elaborate, providing examples of coherent/incoherent provisions (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Considering unclear definitions and non-unanimity in definition of 'target' groups (esp. young people), in particular in case of 'novel tobacco products' and e-cigarettes, there is unwelcome room for misinterpretation at regional or local levels, even when such rules are more or less well defined at national level.

To what extent do you agree that the TPD is coherent with other applicable EU legislation with relevance to tobacco control?

<u>The Tobacco Taxation Directive</u>	Somewhat disagree – the TPD is somewhat incoherent with this legislation
<u>The audio-visual media services Directive</u>	Somewhat disagree – the TPD is somewhat incoherent with this legislation
<u>Tobacco Advertising Directive</u>	Somewhat disagree – the TPD is somewhat incoherent with this legislation
<u>Smoke Free Environments recommendation</u>	Somewhat agree – the TPD is somewhat coherent with this legislation
<u>Single Use Plastics Directive</u>	Somewhat disagree – the TPD is somewhat incoherent with this legislation
<u>Market Surveillance Regulation</u>	Don't know
<u>The CLP Regulation for (Classification, Labelling and Packaging)</u>	Don't know
<u>General Product Safety Directive</u>	Don't know
<u>REACH (Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006)</u>	Somewhat agree – the TPD is somewhat coherent with this legislation

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Definitions in the TPD and TTD are not coherent, the TTD is not up to date in terms of definitions. AVMSD includes products such as heated tobacco products, while the TPD doesn't in terms of TAPS bans (Tobacco Advertising, Promotion and Sponsorship). TPD+TAD include a TAPS ban for e-cigarettes, but not for novel tobacco products. Single Use Plastic Directive currently doesn't consider cigarette butts as toxic waste, while according to the World Health Organization (WHO), which published a report on the impact tobacco has on the environment, 'tobacco waste is the largest type of litter by count globally. Up to 10 billion of the 15 billion cigarettes sold daily are disposed of in the environment. Cigarette butts account for 30-40 % of all items collected in coastal and urban clean-ups'.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the provisions of the TPD are coherent with the FCTC, including the [Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products?](#) In other words, how well do the provisions fit together and how consistent are they with each other, particularly Articles 15 and 16 on tracking and tracing?

Don't know

Section B: EU Added Value

The final few questions are about your views on the extent to which the TPD adds value at the EU level, in a way that may not be attainable at a national or global level.

Has the TPD added value to the regulation of tobacco and tobacco-related products across the EU?

Yes, a great deal

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

While the World Health Organization (WHO) provides technical assistance, guidance and action plans for governments on tobacco control and prevention (most notably through the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control), the EU has legal competences with regards to ensuring a high level of public health in the EU internal market, including with regards to placement, presentation, content and pricing of tobacco and novel products. Considering levels of cross border trade in tobacco and related products (and novel products most recently) and diverging national legislation (e.g. on smoke-free public spaces), EU-wide rules protecting consumers' rights and health are increasingly necessary.

Do you feel that the effects of the TPD on human health or the illicit trade could have been done at the level of Member States, without EU-level involvement?

No, not at all

Please elaborate(max 500 words/3000 characters):

It is possible that some EU MS would have advanced tobacco control measures, while others would have lagged behind, having weaker tobacco control policies than the minimum standard ensured by the TPD. In general, EU added value also acts as an additional level of international scrutiny to national tobacco control measures with any inconsistencies or violations addressed in EU 'public space'. Furthermore, taking into account debates on the cost of no EU, the lack of a minimum standard on tobacco products control across the EU would have deepened health inequalities across EU. Tobacco consumption is the single largest avoidable health risk in the European Union (EU), and the single most significant cause of premature death in the EU, responsible for nearly 700,000 deaths every year. Many forms of chronic non-communicable diseases (NCDs) such as cancer, cardiovascular and respiratory diseases are linked to tobacco use. In addition to causing illness and death, it is also a driver of social and economic inequity between and within European countries. Inequities in tobacco use and tobacco cessation in Europe exist based on factors including economic status, education, gender, ethnicity and location. While the wealthier and higher educated deciles of populations have reduced smoking, poorer, less advantaged and more vulnerable people did not. In general, people from lower socioeconomic groups have higher rates of tobacco use and experience higher levels of death and disability from tobacco than wealthier groups. Experiencing multiple aspects of socioeconomic disadvantage amplifies inequities in tobacco-related harm. The EU aims and needs to address these divergences in order to close gaps in health outcomes between and within its Member States. There are relatively few published studies of interventions to reduce tobacco consumption which focus on equity or the distribution of exposure, vulnerabilities, health outcomes or consequences within the population. Debates around effectiveness of policies and interventions that aim to systematically and universally reduce affordability of tobacco and related products have continued.

What do you think would have happened in the EU if the TPD had not been implemented? Please consider public health objectives, illicit trade, and overall tobacco control.

The objectives would only be partially realised

Please elaborate (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Some MS would have implemented strong tobacco control policies, while others would have lagged behind. This would have exacerbated health inequalities, but also led to far more direct attacks by hostile industries on states acting individually, as unity is strength in public health and the tobacco products market is very much cross border. Illicit trade and cross-border online sale and commercial communication are not primarily national issues so need to be addressed at regional/EU level. The tobacco industry is a global vector of disease and requires global / concerted action with regional (EU) and national enforcement, as provided for clearly in TEU responsibilities.

End of Survey

Thank you for participating in our survey.

Would you be interested in completing a follow up interview over the phone?

No

If you have any further comments you would like to share with us – please detail them in the box below (max 500 words/3000 characters):

Considering that this Review takes place against a background of several new initiatives from the European Commission, notably within a context of the European Green Deal, 'Europe's Fit for Digital Age', as well as ongoing debates on the Future of Europe, those considerations should find their way into the review process now. The TPD, by contributing to an objective of tobacco consumption reduction and hoped decrease in NCDs mortality and morbidity, offers still quite big potential to advance population health. Alignment of the TPD with new instruments at EU level can only increase its EU added value. Last but not least, stronger focus and provisions for addressing health inequalities due to social gradients in tobacco consumption should be more central to the review. It is our opinion that still the most vulnerable groups in Europe - who need most of help in tobacco cessation, protection from smoking initiation - receive it the least.