

Ares (2014) 81542 v

From: [REDACTED] (SANCO)
Sent: 18 December 2013 14:34
To: 'antonella.pederiva@ceccm.eu'
Cc: SCHNICHELS Dominik (SANCO); SANCO CONSULT-D4; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] SANCO D4 SOHO and
TOBACCO CONTROL
Subject: re: Minutes meeting of 27 November 2013
Attachments: 20131127 meeting CEECM TC version.doc; 20131127 meeting CEECM clean
version.doc

Dear Ms Paderiva,

Thank you for your comments on the draft minutes of the meeting in subject.
We consider accepting a number of the proposed changes.

Please find enclosed the draft minutes which we intend to publish, unless you have
comments. We would kindly ask you to reply as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Policy officer



European Commission
Directorate-General for Health and Consumers
Unit D4 – Tobacco control

F101 08/076
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium
[REDACTED]

From: Antonella Pederiva [<mailto:antonella.pederiva@ceccm.eu>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 7:34 PM
To: SANCO D4 SOHO and TOBACCO CONTROL
Cc: SCHNICHELS Dominik (SANCO); [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Minutes meeting of 27 November 2013

Dear Dr Schnichels,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft minutes of the meeting held on the 27th of November last.

We send you in the attachment our proposed track changes.

On two specific issues we would like to stress the following:

Number of value chain stakeholders concerned by the provisions at article 14: The estimate of 5.000 to 6.000 stakeholders refers to wholesalers and does not cover the many thousands EU warehousing and transporting companies that will be affected by these measures as well. As the extent of the Tracking and Tracing requirements is unclear with regard to imports and exports, this number could be a multiple of that, in particular, if all non-EU warehousing, transporting and wholesale operators were included.

Volume of SLIM cigarettes: 6% of the EU cigarette market is still 35 billion stick per year – therefore the cigarette industry will need to adapt its pack and packaging machineries for a significant volume of products.

These comments are included in the proposed review. I thank you in advance for letting us know if you would not consider accepting all our suggestions.

Finally, in order to plan our work-load, we would like to know if the contractor for the feasibility study on T&T has been selected and, if it is the case, who it is and when we can expect to be contacted for the collection of information. I thank you for any info you can share with us on this.

Kind regards

Antonella Pederiva

Secretary General of CECCM
Av Louise 125
B - 1050 Brussels
Tel ++ 32 2 541 00 34
Fax ++ 32 2 541 00 45

Confederation of European Community Cigarette Manufacturers (CECCM) AISBL, registered number 0879 438919 ceccm@ceccm.eu

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged and exempt from disclosure by law. No CECCM staff member can legally commit CECCM AISBL without prior written approval of its authorized representatives.

If you have received it in error, please contact the sender immediately by return email and then delete it from your system; you should not copy it or disclose its contents to anyone.

Emails are not secure and cannot be guaranteed to be error free as they can be intercepted, amended, lost or destroyed, or contain viruses. Anyone who communicates with us by email is taken to accept these risks.

From: SANCO-D4-SOHO-and-TOBACCO-CONTROL@ec.europa.eu [mailto:SANCO-D4-SOHO-and-TOBACCO-CONTROL@ec.europa.eu]
Sent: vendredi 6 décembre 2013 3:56
To: Antonella Pederiva; Kristof.Doms@pmi.com
Cc: Dominik.Schnichels@ec.europa.eu
Subject: Minutes meeting of 27 November 2013

Dear Ms Pederiva and [REDACTED]

Please find enclosed the minutes of the meeting in subject, which we intend to publish, unless you have comments by Friday 13 December 2013 cob at the latest.

Kind regards,

Unit D4 - Substances of human origin and Tobacco control
Health and Consumers DG (SANCO) - European Commission
☎ +32 2 29 56790
☎ +32 2 29 59580
✉ sanco-D4-soho-and-tobacco@ec.europa.eu
F101 08/70, B-1049 BRUSSELS



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Health systems and products
Substances of human origin and Tobacco control

Brussels, 27 November 2013

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

REV CECCM PMI 10.12.13

Participants

Ronan Barry (BAT), Ben Townsend (JTI), Alessandro Tschirkov (ITG), Antonella Pederiva (CECCM), Kristof Doms (PMI), Thilo Paschke (JTI), [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Ralf Ploufmann-Olsen (BAT)

SANCO: Dominik Schnichels, Sigrid Wimmer, Antti Maunu, Ingrida Pucinskaite-Kubik, Patricia Murray

Date: 27 November 2013

~~The cigarette industry representatives stated that they have serious concerns on several provisions covered by the General Approach and the EP amendments to the proposal; however the main objective of the meeting was for the industry representatives to present their views on **Articles 6** (ingredients), **14** (tracking and tracing illicit trade), **25 and 26** (transposition and grace period) of the Tobacco Products Directive under revision. SANCO also asked for comments on **Article 18** (nicotine containing products). The cigarette industry representatives stated that they have concerns on several provisions covered by the General Approach and the EP amendments to the proposal.~~

The SANCO representatives underlined that they would be in listening mode, given the current phase of the legislative process (trilogue negotiations ongoing).

Article 6 – Ingredients

The industry representatives requested to focus here on the 'positive list' of ingredients proposed by the European Parliament (EP) as well as the EP's Article 6.1(d).

According to the representatives, the concept of a positive list is problematic as no clear set of assessment and approval criteria has been proposed to decide which ingredients qualify (or otherwise). It is also unclear who would take final decisions relating to this. They suggested that a better approach would be to first establish guidelines on procedure whilst engaging transparently with the industry, similar to the process that has been applied for ~~and taking~~

~~into account previously established~~ establishing list systems within other sectors, such as EFSA's list for food flavourings and ingredients. Industry representatives also remarked that they did not feel the information they have provided under the current legal framework had been made use of.

The representatives then described how the EP's Article 6.1(d) [proposing to disallow additives that meet the criteria for classification under Regulation 1272/2008, or that result in such substances upon combustion] is of even greater concern to them, as they believe its adoption ~~could lead to would mean a~~ de facto ban on all ingredients in tobacco products. They emphasised ~~said that the purpose of Regulation 1272/2008 is not intended to ban substances ingredients but to guarantee their safe~~ handling and transport of substances. ~~use and added.~~ They also explained that ~~the industry ingredients themselves ensures~~ has the means to through testing under condition of use that additives do not increase the toxicity of the products. ~~It is rather the combustion process that does this, as all ingredients become toxic under combustion. However~~ The representatives made the point that, as is the case for all other organic substances, combustion of ingredients results in the generation of toxic substances (as does the combustion of tobacco).

Their preferred approach would be a toxicological risk assessment of ingredients, excluding additives classified as CMRs in unburned form, and comparison of data from the cigarettes results with and without the additive(s) being tested under conditions of use (combustion). They confirmed that CECCM member companies and PMI have industry has the facilities for such tests and that they already employ this approach to the risk assessment of ingredients in tobacco products.

Asked whether the Council's general approach would be preferable, the representatives said that it is a more feasible option (as it includes a report on a possible future list) though they have concerns regarding certain criteria included in the text, for example, 'addictiveness' or 'attractiveness'. Toxicity alone would be a preferable criterion for the representatives ~~—and although they reiterated that, based on the findings of, the industry ensures through their testing, that once burned,~~ there is no increase stemming from additives in the toxicity of tobacco smoke.

The representatives indicated that they understand the need for regulating ingredients for action, in particular on characterising flavours, and are also not opposed to the concept of a list in general, as long as criteria for inclusion and exclusion are clear and based on sound science. The industry restated its objection to a ban of menthol products on this basis.

Article 14 – Track and Trace

The industry representatives said that they are in favour of tracking and tracing measures but are concerned that the timelines proposed are unrealistic, in particular in view of how far along the supply chain Article 14 requires tracking and tracing to be extended. They claimed that approximately 5000 to 6000 companies —wholesalers AD1— a high number of companies supply chain operators (including e.g. approx. 5000 to 6000 wholesalers) would be covered by the measure.

They said Article 14 would mean significant adaptations (e.g. development of technology, involvement of many economic operators etc.) and as the content of the Implementing Acts is not yet known, an implementation would not be possible within the allotted time. SANCO confirmed that Article 14 only provides the framework for an EU track and trace system. The representatives pointed out that timely and that the adoption of the Implementing Acts legislation is will be crucial before in order for the system to be set up implementation can start.

They added that if the EP amendment on technology having no legal or commercial link to the tobacco industry was adopted, the proposal as a whole could not be implemented.

Asked about *Codentify* system used by the industry, the representatives explained that the standards are now developed by Digital Coding and Tracking Association (DCTA) to which all large manufacturers are member. Membership of DCTA would be open to all tobacco manufacturers and it may be willing to share use of *Codentify* with governments/Commission. Asked to what extent *Codentify* complies with Article 14, the representatives said that it is capable of complying fully, but will need extra time. One company They indicated 4 years from the Implementing Acts for track and trace to pack level to the 1st customer could be reasonable, but then the industry representatives decided to reflect on this and send a response in writing [*in a position paper subsequently received, a minimum of 6 years from the Implementing Acts was mentioned as needed for all economic operators in the supply chain to be compliant with their respective obligations].

The industry representatives indicated it is necessary would be useful to split the timeframe, covering initially the track and trace system until the 1st customer and then the rest of the supply chain. SANCO pointed out, however, that industry has already committed to covering pack level and 1st customer and rolling out beyond this should be the only question discussed here. The representatives agreed that contractual commitments are in place, but some contracts were entered into only recently (2010) and the provision to implement track and trace at pack level is subject to technological development without set deadlines. They also indicated that they are still working testing technology towards for covering to the pack level to the 1st customer.

SANCO said that it will carry out a study how best to implement the tracking and tracing system and invited the industry to cooperate with that project. SANCO also pointed out that the fact that Codentify is a tobacco industry-run body created uneasiness. The representatives said that DCTA is a standard-setting body and does not run the tracking and tracing system. They agreed to send more information in written format.

Article 18 – Nicotine containing products

The industry outlined that it sees the need for product standards, but believes applying pharma legislation would not necessarily address this. goes too far. The EP route is a better approach, but there are gaps in terms of quality assurance. Points remaining to be addressed include child safety, liquid content and labelling. The representatives argued that advertising plays an important role and if too restrictive, diminishes the harm reduction potential of these products.

Articles 25 – Transposition and 26 – Transitional provision

The industry representatives said the timeframes being proposed here are unrealistic and fail to take into account time needed to adapt production lines and shelf life of products. They have major concerns in particular regarding timeframes in Article 26. They would like to see 24 months granted for transposition in Article 25 and an additional 24 months to the COM text (total of 48) for the transitional provisions of Article 26. Concerns were expressed about the Council's Article 26.1(a), which the representatives said creates a timeframe anomaly when viewed alongside the Council's Article 26.1 and needs to be addressed. The representatives said that time for machine conversions/ordering of new machines must be allowed (e.g. to adapt to requirements of Articles 13, 8.3, tax stamp requirements etc.) and as an example pointed to the major changes needed to adapt the slim packets. SANCO, however, pointed out that these occupy only 6% of the market. The representatives agreed, but ~~since (a) the very significant volume of cigarettes impacted by the new provisions, (b) new machines need to be developed to manufacture packaging for slims that complies with 8.3 and (c) that under normal circumstances said that stressed that~~ the time between ordering and receiving a new machine can be up to 22 months, ~~and therefore stressed that more time was needed.~~ They said that in Directive 2001/37/EC, 1 year transitional period was granted for cigarette packs and 2 years for other products. Questioned by SANCO regarding average shelf life of a pack they said that this depends on brand and product and indicated it is seldom greater than 12 months. SANCO suggested such a time would likely be for more niche products than cigarettes and pointed out that the industry is not obliged to await transposition by Member States before implementing changes. The representatives disagreed saying that certain provisions are open to interpretation by individual governments.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Health systems and products
Substances of human origin and Tobacco control

Brussels, 27 November 2013

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Participants

Ronan Barry (BAT), Ben Townsend (JTI), Alessandro Tschirkov (ITG), Antonella Pederiva (CECCM), Kristof Doms (PMI), Thilo Paschke (JTI), Ralf Ploufmann-Olsen (BAT)

SANCO: Dominik Schnichels, Sigrid Wimmer, Antti Maunu, Ingrida Pucinskaite-Kubik, Patricia Murray

Date: 27 November 2013

The main objective of the meeting was for the industry representatives to present their views on **Articles 6** (ingredients), **14** (tracking and tracing), **25 and 26** (transposition and grace period) of the Tobacco Products Directive under revision. SANCO also asked for comments on **Article 18** (nicotine containing products). The cigarette industry representatives stated that they have concerns on several provisions covered by the General Approach and the EP amendments to the proposal.

The SANCO representatives underlined that they would be in listening mode, given the current phase of the legislative process (trilogue negotiations ongoing).

Article 6 – Ingredients

The industry representatives requested to focus here on the 'positive list' of ingredients proposed by the European Parliament (EP) as well as the EP's Article 6.1(d).

According to the representatives, the concept of a positive list is problematic as no clear set of assessment and approval criteria has been proposed to decide which ingredients qualify (or otherwise). It is also unclear who would take final decisions relating to this. They suggested that a better approach would be to first establish guidelines on procedure whilst engaging transparently with the industry, similar to the process that has been applied for establishing list systems within other sectors, such as EFSA's list for food flavourings and ingredients. Industry representatives also remarked that they did not feel the information they have provided under the current legal framework had been made use of.

The representatives then described how the EP's Article 6.1(d) [proposing to disallow additives that meet the criteria for classification under Regulation 1272/2008, or that result in such substances upon combustion] is of even greater concern to them, as they believe its adoption could lead to a de facto ban on all ingredients in tobacco products. They emphasised that the purpose of Regulation 1272/2008 is not to ban substances but to guarantee the safe handling and transport of substances. . They also explained that the industry has the means to test under condition of use that additives do not increase the toxicity of the products. The representatives made the point that, as is the case for all other organic substances, combustion of ingredients results in the generation of toxic substances (as does the combustion of tobacco).

Their preferred approach would be a toxicological risk assessment of ingredients, excluding additives classified as CMRs in unburned form, and comparison of data from the cigarettes with and without the additive(s) being tested under conditions of use (combustion). They confirmed that CECCM member companies and PMI have the facilities for such tests and that they already employ this approach to the risk assessment of ingredients in tobacco products.

Asked whether the Council's general approach would be preferable, the representatives said that it is a more feasible option (as it includes a report on a possible future list) though they have concerns regarding certain criteria included in the text, for example, 'addictiveness' or 'attractiveness'. Toxicity alone would be a preferable criterion for the representatives –and they reiterated that, based on the findings of their testing, there is no increase stemming from additives in the toxicity of tobacco smoke.

The representatives indicated that they understand the need for regulating ingredients, , and are also not opposed to the concept of a list in general, as long as criteria for inclusion and exclusion are clear and based on sound science. The industry restated its objection to a ban of menthol products on this basis.

Article 14 – Track and Trace

The industry representatives said that they are in favour of tracking and tracing measures but are concerned that the timelines proposed are unrealistic, in particular in view of how far along the supply chain Article 14 requires tracking and tracing to be extended. They claimed that a high number of supply chain operators (including e.g. approx. 5000 to 6000 wholesalers) would be covered by the measure.

They said Article 14 would mean significant adaptations (e.g. development of technology, involvement of many economic operators etc.) and as the content of the Implementing Acts is not yet known, an implementation would not be possible within the allotted time. SANCO confirmed that Article 14 provides the framework for an EU track and trace system. The representatives pointed out that timely Implementing legislation will be crucial in order for the system to be set up.

They added that if the EP amendment on technology having no legal or commercial link to the tobacco industry was adopted, the proposal as a whole could not be implemented.

Asked about *Codentify* system used by the industry, the representatives explained that the standards are now developed by Digital Coding and Tracking Association (DCTA) to which all large manufacturers are member. Membership of DCTA would be open to all tobacco manufacturers and it may be willing to share use of *Codentify* with governments/Commission. Asked to what extent *Codentify* complies with Article 14, the representatives said that it is capable of complying fully, but will need extra time. One company indicated 4 years from the Implementing Acts for track and trace to pack level to the 1st customer could be reasonable, but then the industry representatives decided to reflect on this and send a response in writing [*in a position paper subsequently received, a minimum of 6 years from the Implementing Acts was mentioned as needed for all economic operators in the supply chain to be compliant with their respective obligations].

The industry representatives indicated it is necessary to split the timeframe, covering initially the track and trace system until the 1st customer and then the rest of the supply chain. SANCO pointed out, however, that industry has already committed to covering pack level and 1st customer and rolling out beyond this should be the only question discussed here. The representatives agreed that contractual commitments are in place, but some contracts were entered into only recently (2010) and the provision to implement track and trace at pack level is subject to technological development without set deadlines. They also indicated that they are still testing technology for covering to the pack level to the 1st customer.

SANCO said that it will carry out a study how best to implement the tracking and tracing system and invited the industry to cooperate with that project. SANCO also pointed out that the fact that Codentify is a tobacco industry-run body created uneasiness. The representatives said that DCTA is a standard-setting body and does not run the tracking and tracing system. They agreed to send more information in written format.

Article 18 – Nicotine containing products

The industry outlined that it sees the need for product standards, but believes applying pharma legislation would not necessarily address this. The EP route is a better approach, but there are gaps in terms of quality assurance. Points remaining to be addressed include child safety, liquid content and labelling. The representatives argued that advertising plays an important role and if too restrictive, diminishes the harm reduction potential of these products.

Articles 25 – Transposition and 26 – Transitional provision

The industry representatives said the timeframes being proposed here are unrealistic and fail to take into account time needed to adapt production lines and shelf life of products. They have major concerns in particularly regarding timeframes in Article 26. They would like to see 24 months granted for transposition in Article 25 and an additional 24 months to the COM text (total of 48) for the transitional provisions of Article 26. Concerns were expressed about the Council's Article 26.1(a), which the representatives said creates a timeframe anomaly when viewed alongside the Council's Article 26.1 and needs to be addressed. The representatives said that time for machine conversions/ordering of new machines must be allowed (e.g. to adapt to requirements of Articles 13, 8.3, tax stamp requirements etc.) and as

an example pointed to the major changes needed to adapt the slim packets. SANCO, however, pointed out that these occupy only 6% of the market. The representatives agreed, but stressed that the time between ordering and receiving a new machine can be up to 22 months and therefore more time was needed. They said that in Directive 2001/37/EC, 1 year transitional period was granted for cigarette packs and 2 years for other products. Questioned by SANCO regarding average shelf life of a pack they said that this depends on brand and product and indicated it is seldom greater than 12 months. SANCO suggested such a time would likely be for more niche products than cigarettes and pointed out that the industry is not obliged to await transposition by Member States before implementing changes. The representatives disagreed saying that certain provisions are open to interpretation by individual governments.