

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

**NEW TECHNOLOGY
TOBACCO PRODUCTS
&
THE PMI-FUNDED
FOUNDATION FOR A
SMOKE-FREE WORLD
(FSFW)**

**USEFUL INFORMATION FOR TOBACCO
CONTROL ADVOCATES**



April 2019

This document is a compilation from the African Tobacco Control Alliance (ATCA) on the new technology tobacco products as well as the PMI-funded Foundation for a Smoke-Free World (FSFW).

The purpose of the compilation is to provide tobacco control advocates in the region with the latest information on FSFW and the new technology tobacco products which are being marketed by the tobacco industry as so-called 'harm reduction' products and as an alternative to traditional forms of tobacco products. Their use is increasing rapidly in many countries and Africa will most likely witness an aggressive marketing of these products in the years to come.

It is, therefore, critical that tobacco control advocates have a clear understanding of these new technology products to be able to counter the arguments of the tobacco industry and exert influence on decision-makers to address the problem through appropriate policies. In other words, the document tries to answer the many questions that tobacco control advocates are asking these days on the new technology tobacco products.

As indicated above, the document is meant for tobacco control advocates and not for public circulation. The views of different organisations, including those of the tobacco industry, are included here to allow readers to better understand the ongoing debate on these products. It is clear that for health advocates the views of the WHO should prevail and those of the multinational companies should be taken with a pinch of salt as they are propaganda and part of their marketing strategy.

African Tobacco Control Alliance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMES.....2

NEW TECHNOLOGY TOBACCO PRODUCTS.....3

HEATED TOBACCO PRODUCTS (HTPs).....4

- What is a heated tobacco product (HTP)?
- How do HTPs work?
- Are HTPs electronic-cigarettes?
- Are HTPs safer than conventional tobacco?
- Are HTPs safe for second-hand exposure?
- What does WHO recommend?
- What do we not know on HTPs?
- What are some examples of HTPs?

ELECTRONIC NICOTINE DELIVERY SYSTEMS (ENDS)..9

- What are Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS)?
- What are some examples of ENDS?
- How do ENDS (e-cigarettes) Work?
- How safe are E-cigarettes?
- Are ENDS safe for second-hand exposure?
- What does the Royal College of Physicians London say about ENDS?
- What does the British Heart Foundation say about ENDS?
- What does The Heart and Stroke Foundation of South Africa say about ENDS?

ELECTRONIC NON-NICOTINE DELIVERY SYSTEMS (ENNDS)...15

What are Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS)?

BAN ON E-CIGARETTES IN AFRICA.....15

- Are there countries banning the sale of electronic cigarettes?
- Are there countries banning the use of electronic cigarettes in public places?

OTHER QUESTIONS ON ENDS/ENNDS.....16

- Can ENDS/ENNDS effectively help smokers quit?
- What are some health risks of exclusive ENDS/ENNDS use?

FOUNDATION FOR A SMOKE-FREE WORLD (FSFW)..17

- What is FSFW?
- What is the Foundation's relationship with PMI?
- Is the Foundation really independent as it claims?
- What does the Foundation mean by tobacco harm reduction?

VIEWS ON THE FSFW.....21

- What are the views of Philip Morris International on FSFW?
- What does WHO say on FSFW?
- What does CTFK say on FSFW?
- What does The Union say on FSFW?
- What does FCA say on FSFW?

OTHER QUESTIONS ON THE FOUNDATION....24

- Does the Foundation support the World Health Organization
- (WHO) Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC)?
- Why is the WHO condemning the FSFW's work?
- Does the Foundation want to end smoking?

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

- ENDS - Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems
- ENNDS - Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems
- FSFW - Foundation for a Smoke-Free World
- HTPs - Heated Tobacco Products
- JTI - Japan Tobacco International
- NRT - Nicotine Replacement Therapy
- PMI - Philip Morris International
- SHA - Second-Hand Aerosol
- VOCs - Volatile Organic Compounds
- WHO - World Health Organisation

NEW TECHNOLOGY TOBACCO PRODUCTS

HEATED TOBACCO PRODUCTS (HTPs)

HEATED TOBACCO PRODUCTS (HTPs)

What is a heated tobacco product (HTP)?

Heated tobacco products are tobacco products that produce aerosols containing nicotine and other chemicals, which are inhaled by users, through the mouth. They contain the highly addictive substance nicotine (contained in the tobacco), which makes HTPs addictive. They also contain non-tobacco additives, and are often flavoured. HTPs mimic the behaviour of smoking conventional cigarettes, and some make use of specifically designed cigarettes to contain the tobacco for heating.

How do HTPs work?

In order to produce the nicotine-infused vapor, HTPs heat tobacco up to 350°C (lower than 600°C as in conventional cigarettes) using battery-powered heating-systems. The heating-system enclosed in a device, can be an external heat source to aerosolize nicotine from specially designed cigarettes (e.g. iQos and Glo), or a heated sealed chamber to aerosolize nicotine directly from tobacco leaf (ex. Ploom and Pax). The heating device requires charging and the user draws on the mouthpiece at intervals to inhale volumes of the aerosol through the mouth, which is then taken into the body.

Are HTPs electronic-cigarettes?

No, HTPs are not e-cigarettes. HTPs heat tobacco to generate nicotine. E-cigarettes heat e-liquid, which may or may not contain nicotine and in most cases do not contain tobacco.

Are HTPs safer than conventional tobacco?

Currently, there is no evidence to demonstrate that HTPs are less harmful than conventional tobacco products. Some tobacco industry-funded studies have claimed that there are significant reductions in the formation of and exposure to harmful and potentially harmful constituents relative to standard cigarettes. However, there is currently no evidence to suggest that reduced exposure to these chemicals translates to reduced risk in humans. Therefore, additional independent studies will be required to substantiate claims of reduced risk/harm.

Source: WHO

<https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/272875/WHO-NMH-PND-17.6-eng.pdf?ua=1>

HEATED TOBACCO PRODUCTS (HTPs)

Are HTPs safe for second-hand exposure?

Currently, there is also insufficient evidence on the potential effects of second-hand emissions produced by HTPs. Independent studies are needed to assess the risk posed to bystanders exposed to emissions released from HTPs.

What does WHO recommend?

All forms of tobacco use are harmful, including HTPs. tobacco is inherently toxic and contains carcinogens even in its natural form. Therefore, HTPs should be subject to policy and regulatory measures applied to all other tobacco products, in line with the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control.

What do we not know on HTPs?

There is a large knowledge gap, as this generation of HTPs has not been on the market long enough for potential effects to be studied. Conclusions cannot yet be drawn about their ability to assist with quitting smoking (cessation), their potential to attract new youth tobacco users (gateway effect), or the interaction in dual use with other conventional tobacco products and e-cigarettes. Future independent studies should address these effects, as well as the safety and risk of HTPs.

What are some examples of HTPs?

There are a number of these tobacco products available on several markets. Examples include:

IQOS From Philip Morris International (PMI)

IQOS is a tobacco heating system with three main components: – a heated tobacco unit called HEETS or HeatSticks), an IQOS holder, and a charger. The heated tobacco unit contains a uniquely processed tobacco plug designed for heating, not for smoking. The tobacco plug is made from tobacco leaves, which are ground and re-constituted into tobacco sheets, called cast-leaf. These sheets are then crimped and made into a tobacco plug.

At the heart of IQOS are sophisticated electronics that heat specially designed heated tobacco units. IQOS heats the tobacco just enough to release a flavorful nicotine-containing vapor but without burning the tobacco.

Here's the key point: the tobacco in a cigarette burns at temperatures in excess of 600°C, generating smoke that contains harmful chemicals. But IQOS heats tobacco to much lower temperatures, up to 350°C, without combustion, fire, ash, or smoke. The lower temperature heating releases the true taste of heated tobacco.

What is there? A nicotine-containing vapor – not smoke – that makes IQOS a smoke-free product that is appealing to smokers.



Source: PMI - <https://www.pmi.com/smoke-free-products/iqos-our-tobacco-heating-system>

FDA panel rejects Philip Morris's claims that new smokeless cigarette reduces harm

An U.S. advisory panel on Thursday rejected claims by Philip Morris International that a new smokeless cigarette it hopes to sell in the United States reduces the risk and harm of smoking.

The panel, convened by the Food and Drug Administration, agreed with the company's claim that its smokeless cigarette reduces smokers' exposure to harmful chemicals but said the company had **not proved conclusively that that would result in less harm and disease.**

Their key decisions hinged on the belief by many on the panel that Philip Morris hadn't given them sufficient scientific proof that, **while IQOS appears to reduce exposure to harmful chemicals contained in tobacco, it is not clear it would reduce harm to smokers over time.**

Source: *Washington Post*

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/to-your-health/wp/2018/01/25/fda-panel-rejects-philip-morriss-claims-that-new-smokeless-cigarette-reduces-harm/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.bf2bf89ddf5e

Ploom Tech from Japan tobacco international (JTI)

Ploom TECH is an innovative T-Vapor product which enables consumers to experience tobacco without smoke, smell, or ash. When it was first launched in Japan in 2016, the demand was so strong that we immediately made further investment plans.

Source: JTI

https://www.jti.com/sustainability/our_business/tobacco/rrp/ploom/



Glo from British American Tobacco (BAT)



Our flagship THP – glo – comprises a battery-powered device that heats specially-designed tobacco sticks to approximately 240 degrees Celsius. This process produces a nicotine containing aerosol with a tobacco taste which the user inhales. glo was designed in the UK through a process that involved more than 100 experts across five continents, including scientists, engineers, product designers, tobacco specialists and toxicologists. The glo device is one unit, with one button, making it simple and intuitive to use. As the tobacco sticks aren't burned, no ash is produced.

Source: BAT

https://www.bat.com/group/sites/uk__9d9kcy.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DOAWUGNJ

PAX from PAX Labs



At PAX Labs, Inc., we are leading the reinvention of the smoking experience with our innovative, premium vaporizers, PAX and JUUL. Founded by two Stanford Design Program graduates, San Francisco-based PAX Labs, Inc. was developed with the mission of making smoking obsolete. We create superior, beautiful and technologically advanced products that disrupt and redefine the future of smoking. We build products that are not only more effective but also those that consumers can relate to: pleasurable, beautiful experiences. PAX Labs, Inc., aims to deliver the ultimate vaporization experience – the evolution of smoking.

Source: Crunchbase

<https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/pax-labs#section-funding-rounds>

NEW TECHNOLOGY TOBACCO PRODUCTS

ELECTRONIC NICOTINE DELIVERY SYSTEMS (ENDS)

ELECTRONIC NICOTINE DELIVERY SYSTEMS (ENDS)

What are Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS)?

Vapes, vaporizers, vape pens, hookah pens, electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes or e-cigs), and e-pipes are some of the many terms used to describe electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS). ENDS are noncombustible tobacco products.

These products use an “e-liquid” that may contain nicotine, as well as varying compositions of flavorings, propylene glycol, vegetable glycerin, and other ingredients. The liquid is heated to create an aerosol that the user inhales. ENDS may be manufactured to look like conventional cigarettes, cigars, or pipes. Some resemble pens or USB flash drives. Larger devices, such as tank systems or mods, bear little or no resemblance to cigarettes.

Source: FDA

(<https://www.fda.gov/tobaccoproducts/labeling/productsingredientscomponents/ucm456610.htm>)

What are some examples of ENDS?

Some of the most common examples of electronic cigarettes include:

Juul from Juul Labs

From form to technology to flavor, JUUL is easy to use, as there are no buttons or switches. The JUUL ENDS (electronic nicotine delivery system) is a vaporizer that has regulated temperature control and uses a JUULpod filled with a proprietary e-liquid formulation that combines glycerol, propylene glycol, natural oils, extracts and flavor, nicotine and benzoic acid.



Source: <https://www.juul.com/>

blu from Imperial Brands



blu is an electronic cigarette brand owned by tobacco giant Imperial Brands. The brand sells its products in the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Italy.

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blu_eCigs

How do ENDS (e-cigarettes) Work?

Lighting a traditional cigarette causes the tobacco to burn, releasing smoke that contains nicotine. The user breathes in the smoke to deliver nicotine to the lungs. An electronic cigarette doesn't rely on this process of combustion. Instead, it heats a nicotine liquid and converts the liquid to a vapor, or mist, that the user inhales. Depending on the e-cigarette, the user may simply inhale from the cartridge to begin the vaporization process, though some devices have a manual switch that activates the vaporizer inside.

Source: <https://science.howstuffworks.com/innovation/everyday-innovations/electronic-cigarette1.htm>

How safe are E-cigarettes?

Since 2009, FDA has pointed out that e-cigarettes contain “detectable levels of known carcinogens and toxic chemicals to which users could be exposed.” For example, in e-cigarette cartridges marketed as “tobacco-free,” the FDA detected a toxic compound found in antifreeze, tobacco-specific compounds that have been shown to cause cancer in humans, and other toxic tobacco-specific impurities. Another study looked at 42 of these liquid cartridges and determined that they contained formaldehyde, a chemical known to cause cancer in humans. Formaldehyde was found in several of the cartridges at levels much higher than the maximum EPA recommends for humans.

In 2017, a study published in the Public Library of Science Journal showed that significant levels of benzene, a wellknown carcinogen, were found in the vapor produced by several popular brands of e-cigarettes. *The body's reaction to many of the chemicals in traditional cigarette smoke causes long-lasting inflammation, which in turn leads to chronic diseases like bronchitis, emphysema, and heart disease. Since e-cigarettes also contain many of the same toxic chemicals, there is no reason to believe that they will significantly reduce the risks for these diseases.*

Because they are smokeless, many incorrectly assume that e-cigarettes are safer for non-smokers and the environment than traditional cigarettes. However, a study published in the International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health found that the use of e-cigarettes results in increased concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and airborne particles, both of which are potentially harmful when inhaled. Although e-cigarette vapor may not result in the obvious smell and visible smoke of traditional cigarettes, it still has a negative impact on air quality, especially when vaping indoors.

Source: National Center for Health Research

<http://www.center4research.org/vaping-safer-smoking-cigarettes-2/>

Are ENDS safe for second-hand exposure?

A recent systematic review of the health risks from passive exposure to exhaled aerosol from ENDS/ENNDS users – or second-hand aerosol (SHA) - concluded that **“the absolute impact from passive exposure to electronic cigarette vapour has the potential to lead to adverse health effects.”** A WHO-commissioned review found that while there are a limited number of studies in this area, it can be concluded that SHA is a new air contamination source for particulate matter, which includes fine and ultrafine particles, as well as 1,2-propanediol, some Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), some heavy metals, and nicotine.

Source: WHO Report on ENDS/ENNDS – COP 7

https://www.who.int/fctc/cop7/cop7/FCTC_COP_7_11_EN.pdf

There are no long-term studies to back up claims that the vapor from e-cigarettes is less harmful than conventional smoke. Cancer takes years to develop, and e-cigarettes were only very recently introduced to the United States. It is almost impossible to determine if a product increases a person's risk of cancer or not until the product has been around for at least 15-20 years. Despite positive reviews from e-cigarette users who enjoy being able to smoke them where regular cigarettes are prohibited, very little is known about their safety and long-term health effects.

While some argue that exposure to SHA is unlikely to cause significant health risks, they concede that SHA can be deleterious to bystanders with some respiratory pre-conditions. It is nevertheless reasonable to assume that the increased concentration of toxicants from SHA over background levels poses an increased risk for the health of all bystanders.

Source: WHO Report on ENDS/ENNDS – COP 7
https://www.who.int/fctc/cop7/FCTC_COP_7_11_EN.pdf

What does the Royal College of Physicians London say about ENDS?

In the interests of public health it is important to promote the use of e-cigarettes, NRT and other non-tobacco nicotine products as widely as possible as a substitute for smoking in the UK.

Source: Royal College of Physicians
<https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/guidelines-policy/e-cigarettes-inquiry>

What does the British Heart Foundation say about ENDS?

The BHF (British Heart Foundation) would not advise non-smokers to start smoking e-cigarettes. Public Health England (PHE) estimates they are 95 per cent less harmful than regular cigarettes.

Dr Mike Knapton, Associate Medical Director at the BHF, said: “We would not advise non-smokers to take up ecigarettes, but they can be a useful tool for harm reduction and to stop smoking.”

Martin Dockrell, Tobacco Control Programme Lead at PHE, said: “We know that e-cigarettes are probably not completely safe, but that’s not the issue. The question is, are e-cigarettes safer than the alternative? And, for almost all e-cigarette users the alternative is smoking, and it's really important that they understand how much safer e-cigarettes are, compared to smoking”.

Source: British Heart Foundation
<https://www.bhf.org.uk/information-support/heart-matters-magazine/news/e-cigarettes>

What does The Heart and Stroke Foundation of South Africa say about ENDS?

<http://www.heartfoundation.co.za/stop-smoking/>

Electronic cigarettes (ECs) are battery-powered devices that vaporise a liquid into an aerosol. Their use has become increasingly popular. However, scientific evidence on the health implications are inconclusive. Despite this, the HSFSA does not recommend the use of ECs as part of a lifestyle that promotes long-term cardiovascular health. Concerns over safety include exposure to nicotine, particulate matter and other chemicals as well as safety of the electronic device itself since the manufacturing of ECs is unregulated.

Although [some] ECs do not contain tobacco and seem to be less harmful than conventional cigarettes, its long-term safety and use has not been sufficiently studied. A further concern is that ECs may possibly function as a gateway to start cigarette smoking, especially amongst the youth. In essence, using ECs simulates smoking itself which in some way encourages smoking behaviour.



The aerosol (vapor) emitted by e-cigarettes and exhaled by users contains carcinogens, such as formaldehyde, according to early studies. Little is known about these emissions or the potential harm they can cause.

ELECTRONIC NON-NICOTINE DELIVERY SYSTEMS (ENNDS)

What are Electronic Non-Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENNDS)?

ENNDS are basically the same as ENDS with the difference being that they do not contain nicotine.

BAN ON E-CIGARETTES IN AFRICA

Are there countries banning the sale of electronic cigarettes?

In Africa, the sale of e-cigarettes is banned amongst other African countries in; The Gambia, Mauritius, Uganda

Are there countries banning the use of electronic cigarettes in public places?

In Africa, the use of e-cigarettes in public places is restricted in Togo.

Source: Global Tobacco Control

<https://globaltobaccocontrol.org/e-cigarette/vape-free-public-places>

OTHER QUESTIONS ON ENDS/ENNDS

Can ENDS/ENNDS effectively help smokers quit?

The scientific evidence regarding the effectiveness of ENDS/ENNDS as a smoking cessation aid is scant and of low certainty, making it difficult to draw credible inferences. A 2014 review based on two randomized clinical trials (RCTs) concluded that although the analyzed ENDS had a similar, although low, efficacy for quitting smoking, the overall quality of the evidence was low. The WHO-commissioned review reached similar conclusions about the RCTs' quality of evidence and efficacy. In summary, given the scarcity and low quality of scientific evidence, it cannot be determined whether ENDS may help most smokers to quit or prevent them from doing so.

What are some health risks of exclusive ENDS/ENNDS use?

The typical use of unadulterated ENDS/ENNDS produces aerosol that ordinarily includes glycols, aldehydes, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAHs), tobacco-specific nitrosamines (TSNAs), metals, silicate particles and other elements. Dicarbonyls (glyoxal, methylglyoxal, diacetyl) and hydroxycarbonyls (acetol) also are thought to be important compounds in the aerosol. Many of these substances are toxicants that have known health effects resulting in a range of significant pathological changes.

The number and level of known toxicants generated by the typical use of unadulterated ENDS/ENNDS is on average lower or much lower than in cigarette smoke, with a few new toxicants specific to ENDS such as glyoxal. However, the levels of toxicants can vary enormously across and within brands and sometimes reach higher levels than in tobacco smoke. This is probably due, among other things, to the increased thermal decomposition of e-liquid ingredients with rising applied temperatures in open system devices.

Source: WHO

[https://www.who.int/fctc/cop/cop7/FCTC COP 7 11 EN.pdf](https://www.who.int/fctc/cop/cop7/FCTC_COP_7_11_EN.pdf)

FOUNDATION FOR A SMOKE-FREE WORLD (FSFW)

What is the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World?

The Foundation for a Smoke-Free World describes itself as “an independent, private foundation formed and operated free from the control or influence of any third party”, which “makes grants and supports medical, agricultural, and scientific research to end smoking and its health effects and to address the impact of reduced worldwide demand for tobacco”. It was established in September 2017 and formally launched at the [Global Tobacco and Nicotine Forum 2017](#) a tobacco-industry funded event. The Foundation is funded by tobacco company Philip Morris International (PMI).

Visit “[Foundation for a Smoke-Free World: How it Frames Itself](#)” for a detailed analysis of the ways in which the Foundation portrays itself and those who oppose the Foundation, plus the counter evidence to these portrayals.

Source: Tobacco Tactics

http://www.tobaccotactics.org/index.php?title=Foundation_for_a_Smoke-Free_World

The Foundation “collaborates with other non-profit, advocacy and government organizations to advance smoking cessation and harm-reduction science and technology. It also serves as a convener of research, dialogue and ideas to reduce smoking globally, while monitoring, evaluating and helping to address the impact of reduced smoking rates on agriculture and economics.”

Source: FSFW

<https://www.smokefreeworld.org/our-vision>

What is the Foundation’s relationship with PMI?

The Foundation has a [pledge agreement](#) with PMI, stating that PMI is bound to provide the Foundation with funding for 12 years. As long as the Foundation continues to operate and spend money in line with its purpose, as attested to by the Foundation’s Board of Directors and independent external auditors hired by the board, the funding will continue. If for some reason the Foundation becomes inactive or changes its purpose, then PMI could withdraw from further funding.

The pledge agreement also places no restrictions on the Foundation’s activities, including activities that may be critical of the tobacco industry.

Source: FSFW

<https://www.smokefreeworld.org/our-vision/frequently-asked-questions>

Is the Foundation really independent as it claims?

The day after the Foundation's launch, film director Aaron Biebert (whose production company, Attention Era, was commissioned to launch the Foundation) claimed that "PMI will not be the only donor [of the Foundation]. He [Yach] will have other big donations coming from traditional sources like the Gates Foundation or Bloomberg Charities, but decided to get going now despite the potential reputational risk he faces".

This claim was swiftly rebutted by both the Gates Foundation and Bloomberg Philanthropies. The Foundation has asserted that it is "seeking and expects to receive funding from other sources as well", but as of January 2019 no other funders than PMI were listed on the Foundation's website.

The Foundation says that 'independence' and 'transparency' are its core values, and that the Foundation's bylaws prevent PMI and other tobacco companies "from having any influence over how the Foundation spends its funds or focuses its activities". In a BMJ blog post, Yach reasserted that the Foundation operates independently from PMI, citing The Foundation's 'Certificate of Incorporation', 'Bylaws' and 'Pledge Agreement' between the tobacco company and the Foundation as evidence of this independence. The Foundation itself said it would operate "in a manner that ensures the Corporation's freedom and independence from the influence of any commercial entity". However, two independent analyses of the constitutive documents suggest that this is not the case. One, for example, noted that the governing documents have "multiple loopholes" adding that the Foundation "cannot be regarded as independent".

Source: Tobacco Tactics

http://www.tobaccotactics.org/index.php?title=Foundation_for_a_Smoke-Free_World

What does the foundation mean by tobacco harm reduction?

On January 24, 2019, the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World (FSFW) published and advertised an open letter to the World Health Organization Executive Board (WHO EB) enjoining it to "consider how best to work with the Foundation to facilitate a rapid reduction in the use of lethal cigarettes." The FSFW letter claims that: "Harm reduction is part of the FCTC definition of tobacco control. We must do more to raise awareness of the viability of harm reduction."

The latest WHO FCTC documents as well as the WHO global strategies and action plan remain consistent that the focus of tobacco control strategy, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) are the “best buys” including tobacco taxes, regulation of product packaging, and advertising. “Harm reduction” approach is not one of the evidence-based measures that have been proven to work in LMICs settings.

Source: Global Center for Good Governance in Tobacco Control

<https://ggtc.world/dmdocuments/Brief%20Final%20FSFW%202019%20pub%20v3.pdf>

VIEWS ON THE FOUNDATION

What are the views of Philip Morris International on FSFW?

Smoking cigarettes causes serious disease, and the best way to avoid the harm of smoking is never to start, or to quit. But much more can be done to reduce health risks for the world's 1.1 billion women and men who would otherwise continue to smoke. We are building PMI's future on smoke-free products that are a much better choice than cigarette smoking. Our goal is that these products will one day replace cigarettes.

While nicotine is addictive, it is the smoke generated by burning tobacco that is the principal problem. Through groundbreaking research, we have developed a range of smoke-free products that are enjoyable for smokers and have the potential to significantly reduce health risks when compared to smoking.

Source: Sustainable Brands

<https://sustainablebrands.com/read/organizational-change/10-burning-questions-pmi-on-how-it-will-create-a-smoke-free-future>

What does WHO say on FSFW?

Strengthening implementation of the WHO FCTC for all tobacco products remains the most effective approach to tobacco control. Policies such as tobacco taxes, graphic warning labels, comprehensive bans on advertising, promotion and sponsorship, and offering help to quit tobacco use have been proven to reduce demand for tobacco products. These policies focus not just on helping existing users to quit, but on preventing initiation. If PMI were truly committed to a smoke-free world, the company would support these policies. Instead, PMI opposes them. PMI engages in large scale lobbying and prolonged and expensive litigation against evidence-based tobacco control policies such as those found in the WHO FCTC and WHO's MPOWER tobacco control, which assists in implementation of the WHO FCTC. For example, just last year PMI lost a six year investment treaty arbitration with Uruguay, in which the company spent approximately US\$ 24 million to oppose large graphic health warnings and a ban on misleading packaging in a country with fewer than four million inhabitants.

Source: World Health Organization (WHO)

<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/28-09-2017-who-statement-on-philip-morris-funded-foundation-for-a-smoke-free-world>

What does CTFK say on FSFW?

Philip Morris International – the giant cigarette manufacturer – recently announced the creation of its “Foundation for a Smoke-Free World” to support supposedly “independent” research. This announcement is part of the company’s campaign to portray itself as part of the solution to the global tobacco epidemic, which kills more than 7 million people worldwide each year. But the facts tell a different story. Far from being part of the solution, Philip Morris International remains a primary cause of this enormous public health problem and the primary obstacle to greater progress in reducing smoking and other tobacco use around the world. Here are the facts:

Despite its claimed commitment to a smoke-free world, Philip Morris works aggressively to expand the global cigarette market, touting to investors the company’s “robust plans to grow [its] cigarette business.”

Philip Morris continues to make most of its revenue from selling cigarettes, the most deadly form of tobacco use, and brags about selling the world’s top cigarette brand, Marlboro. Philip Morris works across the globe to defeat and undermine policies proven to reduce smoking and other tobacco use.

Source: Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids (CTFK)

https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/assets/content/press_office/2017/PMIrecord.pdf

What does The Union say on FSFW?

The Union today denounced Philip Morris International’s (PMI) launch of a ‘Foundation for a Smoke-free World’ as a billion-dollar bribe the tobacco company hopes will secure it a seat at the table with public health policymakers around the world. “Philip Morris International makes huge profits each year off the back of people who are sick, impoverished and dying as a result of its cigarettes. Tobacco kills half of its users. And nearly 80 percent of smokers live in the world’s poorest countries.

A tobacco-free world will not be built on the blood money of tobacco giants, or the pseudoscience they peddle. It is being built, on the commitment of policymakers to securing the health of populations, and on the integrity and technical excellence of academics and civil society organisations worldwide.”

Source: The Union

<https://www.theunion.org/news-centre/news/the-union-denounces-pmi-launch-of-a-foundation-for-a-smoke-free-world>

What does FCA say on FSFW?

Many details about the new Foundation remain surprisingly vague – notably including the terms of its funding arrangement with PMI. FCA members are left to conclude that it is part of a broader strategy to undermine global efforts, enshrined in the WHO FCTC, to prevent and reduce tobacco use. The FCTC is the world's first health treaty, which binds more than 180 countries and covers more than 90% of the world's population. PMI and other tobacco companies have a long and well documented history of seeking to dilute the FCTC and prevent its implementation.

Source: Framework Convention Alliance (FCA)

<https://www.fctc.org/fca-statement-on-so-called-foundation-for-a-smoke-free-world/>

OTHER QUESTIONS ON THE FOUNDATION

Does the Foundation support the World Health Organization (WHO) Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC)?

On January 24, 2019, the Foundation for a Smoke-Free World (FSFW) published and advertised an open letter to the

World Health Organization Executive Board (WHO EB) enjoining it to “consider how best to work with the Foundation to facilitate a rapid reduction in the use of lethal cigarettes,” and it framed its support in the context of attaining the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The aforesaid statement refers to WHO’s 2017 statement urging all Parties to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), organizations, and individuals not to partner with FSFW because of its sponsor’s “known history of funding research to advance its own vested interest.”

Source: Global Center for Good Governance in Tobacco Control
<https://ggtc.world/dmdocuments/Brief%20Final%20FSFW%202019%20pub%20v3.pdf>

The letter also calls for a review of the WHO’s “initial statement recommending that researchers and governments should not collaborate with FSFW,” and cites the Director General’s (DG) Report which points to challenges in having a consistent definition of how broadly ‘furthering the interests’ should be interpreted” as a basis for reviewing this statement.

Why is the WHO condemning the FSFW’s work?

The FSFW has enthusiastically courted the WHO despite the latter’s two denouncements in September 2017. The [Wire](#) reported that Derek Yach was still undeterred, As of December 2017, he was still writing to top officials at the WHO, seeking for a partnership. The aforesaid statement refers to WHO’s 2017 statement urging all Parties to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), organizations, and individuals not to partner with FSFW because of its sponsor’s “known history of funding research to advance its own vested interest.”

In a 2017 [press release](#), the WHO said it would not partner with the foundation and neither should other governments or the larger public health community. Another [press release](#) said collaborating with the FSFW would be a breach of the FCTC because of the tobacco industry’s interference in this foundation, in this case, Philip Morris, which has given \$80 million to it.

Source: Global Center for Good Governance in Tobacco Control
<https://ggtc.world/2019/03/12/explained-why-a-philip-morris-funded-foundation-is-repeatedly-denounced-by-who/>

Does the Foundation want to end smoking?

The Foundation for a Smoke Free World was set up in 2017 with the sole funding of \$80 million from Philip Morris. Despite the funding, the foundation claims to be independent of Philip Morris and says they “cannot engage in activities designed to support PMI’s interests.” They claim to be interested in promoting smoke-free alternatives to cigarettes, such as e-cigarettes.

But this is directly in the interest of PMI: the company has been lobbying in the US for approval of their e-cigarette product named IQOS. A series of [Reuters investigations](#) showed alleged “irregularities” in the clinical trials for the IQOS and that PMI officials have also been lobbying health officials around the world.

Yach’s letter to the WHO ends with this line: “Our goal is the same—to end smoking in this generation.” However here again, the foundation comes up ambiguous. Twelve months ago, The [Wire](#) reported that the foundation refused to answer if its funder, PMI, should stop making cigarettes.

It is thus unclear how the foundation visualises and hopes to achieve a “smoke-free world,” even as cigarette production thrives, which would seem to be at odds with the foundation’s mandate.

Source: Global Center for Good Governance in Tobacco Control

<https://ggtc.world/2019/03/12/explained-why-a-philip-morris-funded-foundation-is-repeatedly-denounced-by-who/>