



[REDACTED] PH3/DOH/GB

To [REDACTED] OIS/DOH@DOH

cc

13/09/2012 18:49

bcc

Subject: Fw: Complaint about JTI ad

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Tobacco Programme Manager
Department of Health

Tel: 020 7 [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]@dh.gsi.gov.uk

Get off cigarettes with NHS support - call 0800 169 0 169 or visit
www.nhs.uk/gosmokefree

----- Forwarded by [REDACTED] PH3/DOH/GB on 13/09/2012 18:49 -----



Deborah Arnott
<Deborah.Arnott@ash.org.uk>

To [REDACTED] PH3/DOH/GB@DOH

cc

17/07/2012 07:12

Subject: Complaint about JTI ad

Dear [REDACTED]

For your information I submitted the following complaint to the ASA today. As it refers to the DH tobacco strategy 'A smokefree Future' I thought you should be aware. I will let you know what response I get.

Regards,

Deborah Arnott.

The Japan Tobacco International newspaper advertisements on plain packs which can be found at http://www.jti.com/files/7613/4149/4730/JTI_Ads.pdf are in contravention of rule 3.1 of the ASA rules which state that 'Marketing communications must not materially mislead or be likely to do so.'

Version one of the ad has an opened up pack with the following words written on it '*The evidence that removing branding will reduce smoking.... would fit on the back of a cigarette pack*'. This statement is demonstrably untrue.

The systematic review of the evidence commissioned by the Department of Health, carried out by the Public Health Research Consortium (www.phrc.lshtm.ac.uk) and published to inform the consultation is 116 pages long and includes the results of 37 good quality pieces of research. Its conclusions are strong, "This review finds that there is strong evidence to support the propositions set out in the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control relating to the role of plain packaging in helping to reduce smoking rates; that is, that plain packaging would reduce the attractiveness and appeal of tobacco

products, it would increase the noticeability and effectiveness of health warnings and messages, and it would reduce the use of design techniques that may mislead consumers about the harmfulness of tobacco products." It would have to be a very big cigarette pack for the systematic review to fit on the back of it, even bigger if all the individual studies were included too.

The ad goes on to say in the text underneath the image that *"the same policy was rejected in 2008, due to the same lack of evidence"*. This assertion is repeated in the second ad headlined, *"It's not worth the paper it's written on"* which states, *"In 2008 the same policy was rejected when it was found to have no credible evidence."* It is also repeated in the third ad, headlined, *"Isn't the right choice plain obvious?"* which states *"This same policy was rejected in 2008 because there was no credible evidence."* These statements are demonstrably untrue.

In 2008 In 'A Smokefree Future' the government's tobacco control strategy for England, the government concluded that there was evidence to suggest that plain packaging could be effective and that this policy measure would be examined further and more research would be encouraged. More research was carried out and is included in the PHRC systematic review referred to above.

See DH: *A Smokefree Future* 3.25 and 3.26 accessed on 17th July 2012 at

http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_111749

Email Scanned by BBS MessageAngel

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.)

DH users see Computer virus guidance on Delphi under Security in DH, for further details. In case of problems, please call the IT support helpdesk.