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Expectations for tobacco control in L.A in 1999

"Latin America is far for implementing effective tobacco control policies” Dr. A. Peruga

- 1/3 of L.A people as smokers
- Tobacco Control Policies:
  - No SFE country
  - No graphic HWL (just Brazil in 2002)
  - No comprehensive regulation on Tobacco Advertising.
- Tobacco Prices and Taxation: very low.
- Tobacco Control Programme: Just Brazil.
- Tobacco Industry Interference: STRONG
- Tobacco Control Movement: WEAK
Was the tobacco epidemic a problem for Uruguay?

- Uruguay: one of the highest tobacco consumption prevalence in L.A.  
- + 5,000 people died yearly due to tobacco related diseases.  
- The highest lung cancer mortality in men in L.A.  
- The highest COPD prevalence in L.A.  
- Argentina and Uruguay with the highest ETS indoor air contamination levels.  
- Ineffective tobacco control dispositions.  
- Well organized tobacco industry lobby and lack of effective tobacco control movement.

Before 2005

Cigarette packaging

Fumar es perjudicial para la salud

H WL unreadable, uneffective.

94% surveyed facilities with ETS.

Highest ETS levels

Advertising everywhere
Tobacco Control Policy Evolution

- Uruguay ratified FCTC
- First Smoke Free Country in the Americas
- 80% pictured warnings
- Banned brand extension
- Initiated FCTC Implementation
- 50% + images
- Banned misleading terms
- Ad ban but POS
- Increased Taxes: 71%
- FCTC negotiations
- COP 4
- PMI challenge
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- 2010 2011...2014

Presidency Dr. Batlle
Presidency Dr. Vazquez
Presidency Mujica
PROTECTING PEOPLE FROM TOBACCO SMOKE

- March 1, 2006 through a Presidential Decree

-- National Tobacco Control Law (18.256)
Tobacco packaging regulation

2005: Banned Misleading Terms
Tobacco packaging regulation

2007/2008

- **2008**: National TC Law confirmed banning misleading descriptors
- **2008**: By Decree, Single Presentation Requirement

2009

- **2008**: National TC Law confirmed banning misleading descriptors
- **2008**: By Decree, Single Presentation Requirement
By smoking, you can kill yourself. Smoking results in cancer and cardiovascular disease.

By smoking, you don’t last. Smoking decreases physical and sexual endurance.

Smoking makes you reek. Smoking results in bad breath, stained teeth and a foul smell.

By smoking, your baby could die. Exposure of babies to cigarette smoke increases their risk of sudden death.

Smoking could kill your baby. Smoking during pregnancy leads to babies’ death and premature birth.

By smoking, you intoxicate yourself. Cigarettes contain cadmium, a toxic metal that is used in batteries.
Health Warning Labels 2012

FUMAR CAUSA INFARTOS CEREBRALES

www.puedodejar.com

EL HUMO DE TABACO ENFERMA A TUS HIJOS

Los niños expuestos al humo de tabaco tienen un riesgo aumentado de sufrir asma, neumonía, bronquitis e infecciones de oído

www.puedodejar.com
Tobacco Advertising Regulation

- **2005**: Decree restricting tobacco advertising (weak)
- **2008**: National Law – Comprehensive ban but PoS
- **2014**: Total Advertising Ban. Enforced since 2015

Kioscos en Carrasco y Punta Gorda
Tobacco Economics

Relation Prices Index vs Consumer Price Index

Graph showing the comparison between the Tobacco Price Index and the Consumer Price Index from marzo 1997 to marzo 2009.
FCTC IMPLEMENTATION OUTCOMES
A 32-country comparison of tobacco smoke derived particle levels in indoor public places

A Hyland,¹ M J Travers,¹ C Dresler,² C Higbee,¹ K M Cummings¹

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare tobacco smoke-derived particulate levels in transportation and hospitality venues with and without smoking in 32 countries using a standardised measurement protocol.

Methods: The TSI SidePak AM510 Personal Monitor was used to measure the concentration of particles (PM2.5) in 5 micron in diameter (PM5) in 32 countries. Smoking is prohibited in transportation venues in all countries and in most national hospitality venues. In countries with international airports, no difference in PM2.5 levels was observed between smoking and non-smoking areas. The highest PM2.5 levels were observed in countries with a history of smoking bans in public places (relaxing at 22 µg/m³ and 18 µg/m³ and New Zealand at 8 µg/m³). The study found that smoking in public places in the UK, Ireland, and Scotland was associated with a significant increase in acute myocardial infarction in patients admitted to a regional hospital during the 6 months that a local smoke-free ordinance was in effect.¹⁰

DECREASING INDOOR AIR CONTAMINATION LEVELS BY 90%
SMOKING BAN IMPACT ON ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION ADMISSIONS: 2004-2008

Tobacco Consumption in Adults

Sources:
3. National Household Survey 2011C.
Total tobacco consumption and prevalence evolution: Two stages
Cigarette consumption would be 63.8% higher and total tobacco products consumption 27.9% higher without tobacco control policy (2012).

Tobacco taxes and prices would explain 80% of consumption decreasing

D. Curti, 2012
Tobacco Consumption in Youth
Secondary School Survey

Sources:
5th National Secondary School Survey- 2011-
National Drug Commission

2014:
- CDC/WHO: 8,2%
- JND: 9,2%
Tobacco Consumption in Medical Doctors

Sources:
1. SMU
2. SMU
3. CIET/SMU/FEMI
Tobacco Taxation Revenues
2004-2011

*Data from Fiscal Authority

US$ 84:

US$ 318:

D. Curti 2011
ITC URUGUAY
Smokers support to the Smoking Ban at Workplaces

• 9 out of 10 smokers agree/strongly agree with the smoking ban at workplaces.
Uruguay as a tobacco control leader
PMI vs URUGUAY

PMI : URUGUAY VIOLATES INVESTMENT BILATERAL AGREEMENT SWITZERLAND-URUGUAY

ICSID- International Centre for Settlement of Investments Disputes.

1. The prohibition of using different presentations of a brand.
2. Health warnings that cover 80% of the packaging.
3. Images do not fit reality.
The PMI “political” crisis
TOBACCO INEQUITIES:
Low SE groups have higher prevalence

Smokers regarding socio-economic level

ENPTA 2008
TOBACCO INDUSTRY INTERFERENCE and VIOLATIONS
FCTC IMPLEMENTATION IN 2016: the good and the bad

- **ART 5.2**: Not implemented
- **ART 5.3**: Not implemented
- **ART 6**: Working on National Tobacco Policy with earmarking.
- **ART 8**: 100% SFE...needs improvement
- **ART 9-10**: Not much progress
- **ART 11**: 80% HWL, single presentation. To approve Plain Packaging in 2016.
- **ART 12**: Campaigns, lacking a sustainable and resourced strategy.
- **ART 13**: Total Advertising ban, including PoS.
- **ART 14**: Good development...needs improvement
- **ART 15**: Ratified ITP. Interministerial commission working
The International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project
ITC Uruguay

Shannon Gravely, Ph.D.
International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation (ITC) Project
Research Assistant Professor
University of Waterloo
• The ITC Project is the first-ever (and only) international cohort study of tobacco use & policy evaluation

• Overall objective: measure the psychosocial and behavioural impact of key national level policies of the WHO FCTC

• Collaborative effort with international health organizations and policymakers 23 countries
  • inhabited by more than 50% of the world's population and 60% of the world's smokers

• Evaluates the impact of FCTC policies as they are being implemented in many countries throughout the world, including both key HICs and LMICs
  ✓ goes beyond what tobacco surveillance systems can accomplish (e.g. GATS)
  ✓ longitudinal cohort design, it can then assess how a policy is performing at a population level, after it has been implemented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>🇨🇦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>🇺🇸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>🇦🇺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>🇬🇧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>🇮🇪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>🇹🇭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>🇲🇾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>🇰🇷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>🇳🇿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>🇫🇷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>🇩🇪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>🇳🇱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>🇧🇩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>🇧🇷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>🇲🇺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>🇧🇹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>🇮🇳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>🇧🇿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>🇰🇪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>🇧🇭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prospective cohort surveys (e.g. representative samples of smokers)

Assess the impact of effective tobacco control policies in each of the following areas:

- health warning labels and package descriptors
- smoke-free legislation
- pricing and taxation of tobacco products
- communication and education
- cessation
- tobacco advertising and promotion

Collaborate with other researchers in areas such as farming and product regulation

Rich data that allows cross-country comparisons
1. To demonstrate the link between tobacco policy (current tobacco control policies and changes in tobacco control policies) and smoking behaviours (intentions to quit, attempted quitting, successful quitting, reduced consumption)

2. To pursue knowledge translation and exchange approaches that are designed to maximize the public health benefits of research findings within different health contexts

3. To provide evidence to inform local knowledge users and the government (e.g. Ministry of Health), and other decision makers on the effective scaling up of the interventions (tobacco control policies) at the local, national and regional levels
The International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project
ITC Uruguay National Report
FINDINGS FROM THE WAVE 1 TO 3 SURVEYS (2006-2011)
AUGUST 2012

Promoting Evidence-Based Strategies to Fight the Global Tobacco Epidemic
Percentage of smokers in Uruguay who noticed advertisements for brands of cigarettes or tobacco in various venues and media in the last 6 months, by wave

*At Wave 1, the questions asked about cigarettes and tobacco products in general, not specifically about brands. Response options were also yes/no. At Waves 2 to 4, smokers were asked when they last saw or heard about an advertisement for brands of cigarettes or tobacco, with response options ranging from "in the last 7 days" to "never." Thus, response options were combined to create a "within the last 6 months" category which is presented here.

† At Wave 1, the question specified "on shop/store windows or inside shops or stores where you buy tobacco."

‡ At Wave 1, the question only asked about coffee shops, not tea shops or restaurants.
Percentage of male smokers and former smokers who noticed smoking in restaurants (if visited) in the last 6 months, by country.

*Countries with complete smoking bans in restaurants (only air-conditioned restaurants in Thailand) at time of survey.
Pictorial Health Warnings (HWLs)

Article 11 FCTC

Finding from the ITC Uruguay Survey
### Measures of Effectiveness for Health Warnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Response Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noticing Labels</td>
<td>In the last month, how often, if at all, have you noticed the warning labels on cigarette (smokeless tobacco) packages?</td>
<td>Scale of 1-5, from “never” to “very often”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Closely</td>
<td>In the last month, how often, if at all, have you looked at or read closely the warning labels on cigarette (smokeless tobacco) packages?</td>
<td>Scale of 1-5, from “never” to “very often”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking About Health Risks</td>
<td>To what extent, if at all, do the warning labels make you think about the health risks of smoking (using smokeless tobacco)?</td>
<td>Scale of 1-4, from “not at all” to “a lot”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Likely to Quit</td>
<td>To what extent if at all, do the warning labels on cigarette packs (smokeless tobacco packages) make you more likely to quit smoking?</td>
<td>Scale of 1-4, from “not at all” to “a lot”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Labels</td>
<td>In the last month, have you made any effort to avoid looking at or thinking about the warning labels (smokeless tobacco warning labels) – such as covering them up, keeping them out of sight, using a cigarette case, avoiding certain warnings, or any other means?</td>
<td>“Yes” or “No”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave Up a Cigarette</td>
<td>In the last month, have the warning labels stopped you from having a cigarette (using smokeless tobacco) when you were about to smoke one (use one)?</td>
<td>Scale of 1-4, from “never” to “many times”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Health Information Desired on Package</td>
<td>Do you think that cigarette (smokeless tobacco) packages should have more health information than they do now, less information, or about the same amount as they do now?</td>
<td>“Less”, “the same”, or “more”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The impact of the 2009/2010 enhancement of cigarette health warning labels in Uruguay: longitudinal findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Uruguay Survey

Shannon Gravely,1 Geoffrey T Fong,1,2,3 Pete Driezen,1 Mary McNally,1 James F Thrasher,4 Mary E Thompson,5 Marcelo Boado,6 Eduardo Bianco,7 Ron Borland,8 David Hammond2
Feb 2009
8 New Graphic Warnings 50% in size

Feb 2010
6 New Graphic Warnings 80% in size

Uruguay: Impact of pictorial health warnings on smokers’ behaviours after increasing size of warnings from 50% to 80% of front and back of the pack

- **Feb 2009**: 8 new pictorial warnings; 50% of front & back
- **Feb 2010**: 6 new pictorial warnings; 80% of front & back

- **Wave 2** (Oct 2008 - Feb 2009)
  - 65% smokers "often" or "very often" noticed health warnings
  - 41% smokers "often" or "very often" read or looked closely at health warnings
  - 21% smokers made efforts to avoid the health warnings
  - 12% smokers gave up a cigarette "many times" due to health warnings

- **Wave 3** (Oct 2010 - Jan 2011)
  - 72% smokers "often" or "very often" noticed health warnings
  - 49% smokers "often" or "very often" read or looked closely at health warnings
  - 31% health warnings made smokers "somewhat" or "a lot" more likely to quit
  - 24% smokers made efforts to avoid the health warnings
  - 6% smokers gave up a cigarette "many times" due to health warnings
Conclusions & Impact

- The 2009/2010 changes to HWLs in Uruguay, including a substantial increment in size, led to increases of key HWL indicators, thus supporting the conclusion that enhancing HWLs beyond minimum FCTC guideline recommendations can lead to even higher levels of effectiveness.

- Used in Uruguay's legal defense again the tobacco industry: directly refutes Philip Morris International’s claim that increasing the size of the tobacco package health warnings from 50% to 80% would have no impact on the effectiveness of health warnings.
Summary

- Since 2005, Uruguay has instituted a nationwide tobacco control campaign that has resulted in a substantial decline in nationwide smoking rates.
- Among the leading nations with progressive and strong tobacco control policies.
- ITC has been able to evaluate the impact of Uruguay's many policies on smoker’s behaviours and this has provided a solid scientific evidence base to support the strength and success of all tobacco policies.