

# The Tobacco Control Scale 2010 in Europe

Luk Joossens<sup>1</sup> & Martin Raw<sup>2</sup>

1. Advocacy Officer, Association of the European Cancer Leagues,  
Tobacco control expert, Foundation against cancer, Belgium  
[joossens@globalink.org](mailto:joossens@globalink.org)

2. Special Lecturer, UK Centre for Tobacco Control Studies, University of Nottingham,  
England  
[martin@martinraw.com](mailto:martin@martinraw.com)

Correspondence to Luk Joossens

Responsible editor: the Association of the European Cancer Leagues, Chaussée de Louvain  
479, B-1030 Brussels, Belgium

Copyright © Association of European Cancer leagues

This report will be presented at the Fifth European Conference on Tobacco or Health,  
Amsterdam, Netherlands, 28-30 March 2011.

## **Acknowledgements**

LJ and MR received financial support from the Association of European Cancer Leagues, to whom we are extremely grateful. We warmly thank the panel of experts and ENSP correspondents for their crucial contribution to the project and the Dutch Cancer Society and ENSP for the printing of the report, presented at the Fifth European Conference on Tobacco or Health in Amsterdam, 28-30 March 2011.

## Introduction

In this report we describe the results of a survey of tobacco control activity in 31 European countries in 2010, using the Tobacco Control Scale (TCS), first described in our 2006 paper, *The Tobacco Control Scale: a new scale to measure country activity* (1). A description of how the scale was constructed and of the original survey methodology can be found in this paper, and the scale itself is reproduced in Table 1. Because the scale and scoring system changed since 2007 we have presented in Table 2 explanations of the current scoring. Here we report the results of the 2010 survey, show changes in rankings from the last (2007) survey, and discuss the results.

The TCS, which quantifies the implementation of tobacco control policies at country level, is based on six policies described by the World Bank (2) and which they say should be prioritised in a comprehensive tobacco control programme. The six policies are:

- price increases through higher taxes on cigarettes and other tobacco products;
- bans/restrictions on smoking in public and work places;
- better consumer information, including public information campaigns, media coverage, and publicising research findings;
- comprehensive bans on the advertising and promotion of all tobacco products, logos and brand names;
- large, direct health warning labels on cigarette boxes and other tobacco products;
- treatment to help dependent smokers stop, including increased access to medications.

## **Methods**

In 2004 a questionnaire on tobacco control policies was sent to European Network for Smoking and Tobacco Prevention (ENSP) correspondents in 28 countries who had agreed to fill in their country data. (25 EU countries plus Switzerland, Iceland and Norway). They were nominated by ENSP because they were the official country representatives to ENSP, members of their national coalition and thus knowledgeable about tobacco control.(3) In 2005 and 2007 (4) the survey was repeated in 30 European countries (27 EU countries plus Switzerland, Iceland and Norway) and in 2011 with 31 European countries (the 2007 sample plus Turkey). Table 3 shows the 31 correspondents who worked on the 2010 survey.

The Tobacco Control Scale (TCS), showing the points allocated to each policy, with a maximum score of 100, is shown in Table 1. The right column of the blue rows shows the maximum points that can be scored for each policy. In 2010 some changes were introduced in the scoring system and these are explained below.

The data used for the 2011 survey refer to legislation in force on the 1 January 2011, price data on 1 July 2010, and the tobacco control budget in 2009. Any legislation, price increases or funding introduced or enforced after those dates are not included.

A questionnaire was used to collect information about countries' tobacco control budgets and tobacco dependence treatment provision. The following other data sources were used:

### **Price**

- The price of a pack of 20 cigarettes in the most popular price category on 1 July 2010 was based on the July 2010 European Commission report "Excise duty tables" (5)
- The price of a pack of 20 Marlboro cigarettes on 1 July 2010 was collected in July and August 2010 from correspondents in each country
- GDP expressed in Purchasing Power Standards (PPS) per capita and GDP in 2009, and country 2009 population data were collected from the statistical office of the European Union (6).

### **Advertising**

- Commission of the European Communities. Report on the implementation of the Tobacco Advertising Directive, Brussels, 25 May 2008. (TV, Radio, print media, international sponsorship and cross border internet are banned as result of the Directive in all EU countries) (7)
- The WHO report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, Geneva, 2009 (8)
- The ENSP report on tobacco advertising legislation in Europe, Brussels, 2009 (9).
- An update of the legislation on advertising through ENSP correspondents or health officials (see Table 2)

### **Smokefree legislation**

- ENSP, European trends towards smokefree provisions, Brussels, January 2011 (10)
- European Commission, Implementation of smokefree laws in the EU, Brussels, May 2010 (11)
- European Commission, Eurobarometer 332, Special Tobacco, Brussels, 2010 (12)
- Copies of the national legislation made available by the European Commission, January 2011.

## Labelling

- Canadian Cancer Society, Cigarette package health warnings, International status report, Ottawa, November 2010. (Labelling of tobacco products in the EU countries is regulated by the 2001 Tobacco Products Directive, which simplifies the monitoring of this policy) (13)

## Cessation and tobacco control budget

- Information was collected in November and December 2010 through ENSP correspondents or health officials (see Table 3)
- Bridgehead International, EQUIPP: Europe Quitting - Progress and Pathways, London, 2011 (14)

## Changes in methodology and scoring system

In the 2007 survey most of the data were collected through a questionnaire which relied principally on the expert judgement of the correspondents who completed it. This proved problematic where judgements were required of, for example, whether particular smokefree legislation was well enforced or not. In the current survey we have reduced the subjectivity in these judgements by using the results of the eurobarometer surveys to evaluate the enforcement of the smokefree legislation. The changes to the scale items and scoring were agreed in May 2010 by the following European tobacco control experts: Ann McNeill (UK Centre for Tobacco Control Studies, University of Nottingham, UK), Yves Martinet (Comité National contre le Tabagisme, France), Marc Willemsen (Stivoro, Netherlands), Cornel Radu-Loghin (ENSP, Brussels), Florence Berteletti Kemp (Smoke-Free Partnership, Brussels), Luk Joossens (ECL, Brussels), Martin Raw (UK Centre for Tobacco Control Studies, University of Nottingham, UK).

**Price** Only the method to calculate the points maximum was changed. In 2007 the country with the highest prices and tobacco control budgets received maximum points, In 2010 the country whose pack price was 7.5 euro received 15 points, taking into account affordability, measured by purchasing power standards (PPS)), (see text in Table 2). **Budget** The 2007 spending totals included spending on tobacco dependence treatment services but these were removed from the 2010 total, because funding for cessation services is already taken into account in the section on treatment. **Advertising and promotion bans** Two points were added for a ban on the display of tobacco products at point-of-sale and one point for standardized packaging (which means only one standardised form and size of cigarette packs) (see Table 1 and Appendix 1 (Table 1 from 2007)). **Treatment** In this scale one point is allocated for the recording of smoking in medical notes, and one point for reimbursement of family doctors for providing brief advice. Small changes were made to the quitline definition (see Table 1 and Appendix 1). **Health warning** There are four points newly awarded for plain packaging, as a result of which the other points were reduced (see Table 1 and Appendix 1). **Smokefree public/workplaces** The key change is the use of the eurobarometer survey to evaluate the enforcement of the smokefree legislation

**Table 1. The Tobacco Control Scale, 2010 (TCS)**

<b>Price of cigarettes and other tobacco products</b>	<b>30</b>
Price of Marlboro, and price of most popular price category, in July 2010 – additive	
The price of Marlboro in July 2010, taking into account the Purchasing Power Standards (PPS). The country with a price of Marlboro of €7.50 a pack and an EU average Purchasing Power Standard, receives 15 points. (see Table 2).	15
The price of a packet of cigarettes in the most popular price category in July 2010, taking into account the PPS. The country with a price of €7.50 a pack, based on the EU average PPP, receives 15 points.	15
<b>Smoke free work and other public places</b>	<b>22</b>
Workplaces excluding cafes and restaurants – <b>one only</b> of	<b>10</b>
Complete ban without without exceptions (no smoking rooms); enforced (see Table 2)	10
Complete ban, but with closed, ventilated, designated smoking rooms under very strict rules; enforced (see Table 2)	8
Complete ban, but with ventilated, designated smoking rooms (not areas or places); enforced	6
Meaningful restrictions; enforced (75% of the workplaces are smoke free) (see Table 2)	4
Legislation, but not enforced	2
Cafes and restaurants – <b>one only</b> of	<b>8</b>
Complete ban; enforced	8
Complete ban, but with closed, ventilated, designated smoking rooms (not area's or places); enforced	6
Meaningful restrictions; enforced (50% of bars and restaurants are smoke free) (see Table 2)	4
Legislation, but not enforced	2
Public transport and other public places – additive	<b>4</b>
Complete ban in trains without exceptions	1
Complete ban in other public transport without exceptions	1
Complete ban in educational, health, government and cultural places without exceptions <b>OR</b> Ban in educational, health, government and cultural places, but with designated smoking areas or rooms	2 1
<b>Spending on public information campaigns</b>	<b>15</b>
Tobacco control spending (TCS) per capita by the government in 2009, expressed in Power Purchasing Standards. The country, which spends 2 euro per capita, based on the EU average GDP per capita expressed in PPP, receives 15 points. (see Table 2).	
<b>Comprehensive bans on advertising and promotion</b>	<b>13</b>
Points for each type of ban included – additive	
Complete ban on tobacco advertising on television and radio	2
Complete ban on outdoor advertising (eg. posters)	2
Complete ban on advertising in print media (eg. newspapers and magazines)	1 ½
Complete ban on indirect advertising (eg. cigarette branded clothes, watches, etc)	1
Ban on display of tobacco products at the point of sales	2
Ban on point of sale advertising	1
Ban on cinema advertising	1
Ban on sponsorship	1
Ban on internet advertising	½
Standardized cigarette packaging (which means only one standardised form and size of cigarette packs)	1

<b>Large direct health warning labels</b>	<b>10</b>
Pain packaging (the removal of trademarks, logos, colours and graphics, except for the government health warnings and for the brand name, presented in a standardized typeface) in combination with pictorial health warnings in the front and the back of the tobacco product packages	4
Size of warning – <b>one only</b> of	3
50% or less of packet	1
51 – 79% of packet	2
80% or more of packet	3
Pictorial health warnings – additive	3
Pictorial health warnings on cigarette packs	2
Pictorial health warning on hand rolling tobacco	1
<b>Treatment to help dependent smokers stop</b>	<b>10</b>
Recording of smoking status in medical notes	1
Legal or financial incentive to record smoking status in all medical notes or patient files	1
Brief advice in primary care	1
Family doctors reimbursed for providing brief advice	1
Quitline	2
National quitline or quitlines in all major regions of country	1
<b>ADDITIONAL POINT FOR</b>	1
Quitline counselors answering at least 30 hours a week (not recorded messages)	1
Network of smoking cessation support and its reimbursement – <b>one only</b> of	4
Cessation support network covering whole country , free	4
Cessation support network but only in selected areas, eg. major cities ; free	3
Cessation support network covering whole country , partially or not free	3
Cessation support network but only in selected areas, eg. major cities , partially or not free	2
Reimbursement of medications – <b>one only</b> of	2
Medications totally reimbursed or free to users <b>or</b>	2
Medications partially reimbursed	1

**Table 2. Notes and explanations of the 2010 TCS scoring**

<b>Price</b>
Gross Domestic Product per capita can be expressed in PPS (purchasing Power Standard). PPS per capita has been used to take account of the real purchasing power in different countries. In the EU the GDP per capita expressed in PPP varies from 44 in Bulgaria to 93 in Greece, 127 in Ireland and 271 in Luxembourg. The EU average = 100. The country with a price of €7.50 a pack, based on the EU average PPP (100), receives 15 points. Ireland, for instance, would receive 15 points, if the price of a pack would be $7.5 \times 1.27 = \text{€}9.52$ . In Bulgaria, if the price of a pack would be $7.5 \times 0.44 = \text{€}3.30$ .
<b>Bans on smoking in public and work places with no exemptions and no smoking rooms</b>
Only total bans work well and comply with Article 8 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), Council Recommendation on Smoke Free environments of 30 November 2009 (2009/C 296/02) and the ENSP recommendations adopted in November 2010 ( <a href="http://www.ensp.org/sites/default/files/ENSP_declaration_total_ban_FINAL.pdf">http://www.ensp.org/sites/default/files/ENSP_declaration_total_ban_FINAL.pdf</a> ).
<b>Smoking rooms</b>
A smoking room is a closed indoor premise with ceilings, floor and walls. Norms for smoking rooms may vary. In some countries, very strict conditions apply to smoking rooms (size, ventilation norms, closure of the doors, cleaning), which makes it almost impossible to build them (examples France, Italy and Finland).
<b>Meaningful restrictions: workplaces</b>
We have given points for “meaningful restrictions” but emphasise that this means that the legislation is imperfect, and thus is not encouraged. ‘Meaningful restrictions: workplaces’ means smokefree legislation that only applies to some regions of the country (eg. in federal countries like Germany and Switzerland), the legislation contains exceptions, or allows smoking in indoor premises which are not defined as closed (such as places and area’s). ‘Enforced meaningful restrictions’ means that at least 75% of those who work indoors are never or almost never exposed to tobacco smoke at work.
<b>Meaningful restrictions: bars and restaurants</b>
‘Meaningful restrictions: bars and restaurants’ means for example that the smokefree legislation only applies to some regions of the country (eg. in federal countries like Germany and Switzerland), the legislation contains exceptions (such as bars, small size establishments or during specific hours) or allows smoking in indoor premises which are not defined as closed (such as places and area’s). ‘Enforced meaningful restrictions’ means that at least 50% of the bars and restaurants are smokefree.
<b>Tobacco control spending</b>
Government funding at national level (for federal countries the sum of all funding by governments of the different regions, but <b>not</b> of the local communities) in 2009 for mass communication campaigns, tobacco control projects, educational programs, support for non-governmental organizations. Tobacco control spending from sources other than the government, such as the private sector, is <b>not</b> included in our figure. Funding for tobacco dependence treatment (including reimbursement of medications and quitlines) and enforcement of legislation are <b>not</b> included in our figure. The country, which spends 2 euro per capita on tobacco control, based on the EU average GDP per capita expressed in PPP, receives 15 points. In the EU the GDP per capita expressed in PPP varies from 44 in Bulgaria to 93 in Greece, 127 in Ireland and 271 in Luxembourg. The EU average = 100. Ireland, for instance, would receive 15 points, if the spending would be $\text{€}2 \times 1.31 = \text{€}2.54$ per capita. In Bulgaria, if the spending would be $\text{€}2 \times 0.44 = \text{€}0.88$ per capita.

**Table 3. The 31 national correspondents who worked on the 2011 survey**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Austria	Manfred Neuberger	Medical University of Vienna
Belgium	Suzanne Gabriels	Belgian Foundation against Cancer
Bulgaria	Ekaterina Borissova	Bulgarian Coalition against Tobacco
Cyprus	Stelios Sycallides	Cyprus National Coalition for the Prevention of Smoking
Czech Rep	Eva Kralikova	Czech Coalition against Tobacco
Denmark	Jorgen Falk, Niels Kjaer	National Board of Health, Danish Cancer Society
Estonia	Andrus Lipand	Ministry of Social Affairs of Estonia
Finland	Mervi Hara	Suomen ASH
France	Clémence Cagnat-Lardeau	French Alliance against Tobacco
Germany	Martina Pötschke-Langer, Nick Schneider, Friederich Wiebel	German Cancer Research Centre, German Smoke-Free Alliance
Greece	Constantin Vardavas	Hellenic Cancer Society
Hungary	Tibor Demjen	Department of Health
Iceland	Bara Sigurjonsdottir	Public health institute of Iceland
Ireland	Brid Leahy	ASH Ireland
Italy	Lorenzo Spizzichino	Department of Health
Latvia	Alise Krumina	Latvian National Coalition on Tobacco and Alcohol Control
Lithuania	Aurelijus Veryga	Kaunas University of Medicine
Luxembourg	Lucienne Thommes	Fondation Luxembourgeoise contre le Cancer
Malta	Anne Buttigieg	Health Promotion Department
Netherlands	Fleur Van Bladeren	Foundation on Smoking or Health (Stivoro)
Norway	Siri Naesheim,	Directorate for Health and Social Affairs
Poland	Krzysztof Przewozniak	Polish Civil Coalition “Tobacco or Health”
Portugal	Emilia Nunes	Department of Health
Romania	Cornel Radu-Loghin	ENSP
Slovakia	Tibor Baska	Institute of Epidemiology
Slovenia	Mihaela Lovse	Slovenian Coalition for Tobacco Control
Spain	Esteve Fernandez	National Committee for Smoking Prevention (CNPT)
Sweden	Mathias Jansson	Swedish National Institute of Public Health
Switzerland	Verena El Fehri	Association Suisse pour la Prévention du Tabagisme
United Kingdom	Robert West, Andrew Black, Owen Evans, Sheila Duffy	University College London, Department of Health, ASH Scotland
Turkey	Elif Dagli	National Coalition on Tobacco or Health

## Results

Table 4 shows the 2010 TCS scores of each country, in rank order, with their 2007 ranking shown for comparison.

Turkey was included in our survey for the first time and the surprise was that Turkey is in the top five in the table. Despite a strong tobacco history and high smoking prevalence in men, Turkey successfully introduced comprehensive smoke free legislation. The legislation applies the highest standards (no exceptions, no smoking rooms) and is well respected, according to results of the eurobarometer survey, which took place a few months after its implementation in July 2009.

Spain also introduced comprehensive smokefree legislation in bars and restaurants in January 2011, but lost points as result of reduced funding for tobacco control activities and weak enforcement of the smokefree legislation in workplaces.

The five countries (UK, Ireland, Norway, Turkey and Iceland), which lead the ranking, have in common a policy of high prices and the adoption of comprehensive smokefree legislation. Three of them adopted legislation, which bans the display of tobacco products at the point of sale. The UK remains number one and is doing well on all six of the World Bank tobacco control policies.

We observed falls in rankings in six countries – Hungary, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Poland, Cyprus and Estonia, which reflects in most cases a lack of activity in the period 2007-2010.

Table 4. European countries ranked by total TCS score in 2010

2010 rank	Country	2007 rank	Change in rank	Price (30)	Public place bans (22)	Public information campaign spending (15)	Advertising bans (13)	Health warnings (10)	Treatment (10)	Total (100)
1	UK	1	-	26	21	8	9	4	9	77
2	Ireland	2=	-	27	21	1	12	2	6	69
3	Norway	4	▲1	25	17	2	12	1	5	62
4=	Turkey	-	-	25	21	-	7	5	3	61
4=	Iceland	2=	▼2	20	17	9	12	1	2	61
6	France	7	▲1	21	17	1	9	1	6	55
7=	Finland	8=	▲1	17	17	2	10	2	4	52
7=	Malta	5	▼2	19	17	-	9	1	6	52
9	Sweden	6	▼3	17	15	2	10	1	6	51
10	Belgium	8=	▼2	17	13	2	8	4	6	50
11	Switzerland	18	▲7	15	11	9	2	5	6	48
12	Italy	10	▼2	16	17	-	8	1	5	47
13=	Spain	12	▼1	14	17	1	9	1	4	46
13=	Denmark	20	▲7	16	11	3	8	1	7	46
13=	Netherlands	14=	▲1	16	13	1	9	1	6	46
16=	Romania	14=	▼2	21	7	-	7	3	7	45
17=	Slovenia	25=	▲8	13	15	-	9	1	6	44
17=	Latvia	24	▲7	18	14	-	9	3	0	44
19=	Portugal	23	▲4	18	11	-	8	1	5	43
19=	Estonia	11	▼8	14	12	-	10	1	6	43
19=	Poland	14=	▼5	15	11	-	9	1	7	43
22=	Slovakia	17	▼5	15	10	-	9	1	6	41
22=	Lithuania	21	▼1	17	12	-	8	1	3	41
24=	Cyprus	19	▼5	14	11	-	10	1	4	40
24=	Bulgaria	13	▼11	21	6	-	10	1	2	40
26	Germany	27	▲1	17	11	-	4	1	4	37
27=	Hungary	22	▼5	15	6	-	7	1	5	34
27=	Czech Republic	25=	▼2	14	7	-	8	1	4	34
29	Luxembourg	28=	▼1	5	11	-	9	1	7	33
30=	Austria	30	-	13	7	-	7	1	4	32
30=	Greece	28=	▼2	15	7	-	6	1	3	32

Note: the empty cells for public information campaign spending reflect missing data or zero scores

## Discussion

Martinez-Sanchez and colleagues examined the relationship between TCS scores and smoking prevalence in the 27 EU countries and found that higher TCS scores were strongly associated with lower smoking prevalence (15). In a study in 18 European countries Schaap and colleagues found a positive association between TCS scores and age standardised quit ratios (16). Hublet and colleagues examined the associations between tobacco control policies at country level, drawn from the TCS, and smoking prevalence in 15 year old adolescents in 29 European countries. They found that policies on price, smoking in public and advertising bans may help to reduce smoking prevalence in boys, but that the associations were weaker for girls (17). Another study confirmed the relationship between secondhand smoke exposure in nonsmokers, as assessed by exhaled carbon monoxide, and TCS scores in the 27 EU countries (18).

Overall countries, which failed to undertake new initiatives, lost TCS points and fell in the ranking. Countries with comprehensive policies in the six tobacco control policies are leading tobacco control in Europe.

A specific concern is the lack of funding for tobacco control. Two thirds of the countries spent less than 10 euro cent per capita on tobacco control. The TCS scores for spending on tobacco control are extremely low. We are seeing reduced funding for tobacco control in several countries and there is clearly a risk of even further reductions in the coming years. Only Switzerland, Iceland and UK secured reasonable (but not sufficient) tobacco control funding in 2009.

Price policy remains the most effective way to reduce sales. Prices in Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria and Latvia increased strongly in recent years, but only as result of obligations under the 2002/10/EC Tobacco Tax Directive. Norway has the highest cigarette prices in Europe and probably in the world: 10 euro for a pack of Marlboro in the supermarket and 12 euro in the kiosk. Ireland has the highest prices in the EU, as the UK was affected by the unfavourable currency exchange of the British Pound towards the Euro in recent years.

### Comments on individual countries

Here we comment briefly on individual countries, in reverse order of their 2010 ranking (in brackets the 2007 ranking and up or down movement).

**30. Austria** (30). A low profile on all tobacco control policies.

**30. Greece** (28 ▼2). Greece increased taxes but still has one of the highest per capita consumptions of cigarettes in the world. Despite recent efforts to make public places smokefree, compliance with the law remains low.

**29. Luxembourg** (28 ▼1). Despite being the richest country in the EU Luxembourg has low taxes on tobacco products in order to attract cross border shopping from neighbouring countries. Luxembourg banned tobacco advertising and introduced legislation banning smoking in public places and restaurants in the last few years.

**27. Czech Republic** (25 ▼2). No progress to report since 2007. There is a strong tobacco

industry presence in the Czech Republic, for example, the Czech President opened a new Philip Morris factory in 2010 and the Czech Republic is the only EU country, which has not ratified the FCTC.

**27. Hungary** (22 ▼5). No progress to report since 2007. A strong tobacco industry presence is an obstacle to progress in Hungary also.

**26. Germany** (27 ▲1). Germany has a strong tobacco industry presence and influence. Germany's impact on EU tobacco control policy should be closely monitored. Partial smoking bans have been introduced recently, but overall tobacco control legislation remains weak. Recent smokefree legislation adopted by some länder, such as in Bavaria, are promising developments.

**24. Bulgaria** (13 ▼11). No significant progress to report since 2007. Bulgaria has not introduced comprehensive tobacco control legislation, and enforcement of existing smokefree legislation remains a problem. It's drop in ranking reflects this relative inactivity.

**24. Cyprus** (19 ▼5). In 2010 Cyprus adopted comprehensive legislation banning smoking in bars and restaurants; it is well respected in restaurants but less in bars. Taxes have surprisingly not been raised for many years.

**22. Lithuania** (21 ▼1). As with Latvia, Lithuania significantly increased taxes on tobacco products in recent years.

**22. Slovakia** (17 ▼5). No progress to report since 2007. Again the drop in ranking reflects relative lack of activity compared with other countries

**19. Poland** (14 ▼5). Poland is losing momentum in combating the tobacco epidemic. The new smokefree legislation contains loopholes, the retail price of cigarettes of the most popular price category was the lowest in the EU in July 2010 (although the real price of cigarettes increased in recent years) and state funding for tobacco control remains very low.

**19. Portugal** (23 ▲4). Portugal introduced partial smokefree legislation in bars and restaurants in 2008.

**19. Estonia** (11 ▼8). No significant progress to report since 2007.

**17. Latvia** (24 ▲7). Latvia introduced pictorial health warnings in 2010 and doubled the price of cigarettes over recent years.

**17. Slovenia** (25 ▲8). Slovenia introduced successful smokefree legislation in 2007.

**16. Romania** (14 ▼2). Romania introduced pictorial health warnings on cigarette packs in 2008 and significantly increased price in recent years. However enforcement of its smokefree legislation is weak. The tobacco industry established a very close relationship with the government in combating illicit tobacco trade.

**13. Netherlands** (14 ▲1). Introduced smokefree legislation in bars and restaurants in 2008 but in 2010 lifted the smoking ban for bars of 70m<sup>2</sup> or less without staff (ie. only an

owner). As a result ashtrays are back on the table in 54% of bars and discotheques. In addition funding for media campaigns was discontinued in 2011. As in Germany, the tobacco industry has a strong presence and influence.

**13 Denmark** (20 ▲7). New smokefree legislation came into force in August 2007; although it is not perfect it is well enforced.

**13. Spain** (12 ▼1). The 2005 so-called Spanish model (weak smokefree legislation in bars and restaurants), praised by the tobacco industry, is finally dead. In 2010 Spain adopted far reaching and comprehensive legislation on smokefree bars and restaurants. Pictorial health warnings will appear in 2011. The overall ranking remains little changed because of reductions in funding and problems enforcing smokefree workplaces.

**12. Italy** (10 ▼2). No progress to report since 2007, or in fact since the successful and well respected 2005 smokefree legislation.

**11. Switzerland** (18 ▲7). Switzerland has weak tobacco advertising legislation and has not ratified the FCTC. In April 2004 a fund was established by law to support tobacco control activities, financed by an obligatory contribution from the tobacco industry. In 2009 the fund budget was around 12 million Euros. Many cantons adopted smokefree legislation and at federal level, pictorial health warnings with the number of the quitline on all packs were introduced in 2010.

**10. Belgium** (8 ▼2). Belgium missed a golden opportunity to adopt comprehensive smokefree legislation when the parliament modified legislation in December 2009. The new law still permits smoking in bars, discotheques and casinos. Data from the Ministry of Health show that half of the bars in 2010 don't respect the weak restrictions, which applied to them. Belgium was the first EU country to introduce pictorial health warnings in 2006 and to print the number of the quitline on all cigarette packs in 2011.

**9. Sweden** (6 ▼3). No significant progress to report since 2007. Has one of the lowest daily smoking rates in Europe but the highest use of smokeless tobacco (snus) by men in Europe. Sweden has a good record on tobacco control but no new initiatives were taken in recent years. Surprisingly Sweden is often NOT in support of strong tobacco control measures at European and international level.

**7. Malta** (5 ▲1 ▼2). There are problems enforcing smokefree legislation in bars in Malta. Pictorial health warnings will be introduced in 2011 and smoking rooms will be banned in 2013.

**7. Finland** (8 ▲1). Finland adopted an ambitious plan to make the country tobacco free by 2040 and will introduce a ban on the display of tobacco products at point of sale in 2012.

**6. France** (7 ▲1). France successfully implemented smokefree legislation in 2007-2008 despite enforcement problems with outside terraces. Pictorial health warnings will be introduced in 2011 for cigarettes and in 2012 for other tobacco products. Funding for tobacco control has strongly decreased and is under further attack.

**4=. Iceland** (2 ▼2). Iceland has adopted very comprehensive tobacco control legislation (including a point of sale display ban) and has the lowest daily smoking prevalence in Europe

(15% in 2009). Iceland has the second high spending on tobacco control per capita in Europe, despite an unfavourable currency rate against the euro. The law obliges the government to spend at least 0.9% of the total amount spent on tobacco, on tobacco control.

**4=.** **Turkey** (not in last survey). Turkey has the best labelling provisions in Europe (a pictorial health warning covering 65% of the front of the pack), successfully introduced comprehensive smokefree legislation (no exceptions, no smoking rooms) in 2009 and doubled the price of cigarettes from 2005 to 2010, despite being a country with a long tradition of tobacco use and high smoking prevalence in men. According to an article in Tobacco Reporter “Turkey is becoming like a “normal” market. For the tobacco industry, that’s not necessarily a reason to celebrate.”(19)

**3.** **Norway** (4 ▲ 1). Norway has been and remains one of the strong leaders in tobacco control in Europe since the 1960s. It recently introduced a ban on tobacco displays at the point of sale and has the highest cigarette prices in the world: around 11 euros a pack in 2010. In addition the Norwegian government sold its investments in all companies that derive more than five percent of their profit from tobacco production.

**2.** **Ireland** (2 -). In March 2004 Ireland led the way in Europe by becoming the first country to implement smokefree legislation in pubs and restaurants. Ireland has the highest cigarette prices in the EU and has recently introduced a ban on tobacco displays at the point of sale.

**1.** **UK** (1 -). The UK remains number one and is doing well on all six of the World Bank tobacco control policies. The UK also has a policy to protect public health policies on tobacco control from commercial interests (thus they have implemented Article 5.3 of the WHO FCTC (20). However a new UK government came into power in 2010 and there is a risk that investment in and commitment to tobacco control policy will be reduced. Spending on media campaigns has already been stopped, in April 2010. Furthermore the new government has not yet confirmed if the legislation to ban tobacco displays at the point of sale will be implemented, and even if it is, implementation is likely to be postponed.

### **Areas for improvement**

According to the stock analysts Morgan Stanley “Of the various measures available to governments in reducing demand for tobacco, clearly the one that concerns the cigarette companies the most is rising taxation.” (21). High price remains the most effective tobacco control measure, thus it is important to note that the price of tobacco products varies greatly in Europe. On 1 July 2010 a pack of Marlboro cigarettes ranged from €2.55 in the Baltic countries to €8.55 in Ireland and €11 in Norway.

According to Morgan Stanley again “the other two regulatory environment changes that concern the industry the most are homogenous packaging and below-the-counter sales. Both would significantly restrict the industry’s ability to promote their products.”(21)

A ban on displaying tobacco products at the point of sale exists in three European countries (Iceland, Ireland and Norway) and will be introduced in Finland in 2012. Six European countries (Belgium, Romania, UK, Latvia, Switzerland and Turkey) require pictorial warnings on cigarette packets and four will introduce them in 2011: Malta, France, Spain and Norway. The global trend is towards larger health warnings with pictures. Uruguay, for instance, has implemented legislation to make pictorial health warnings obligatory, covering

80% of the front and the back of cigarette packs.

The 2001 EU Tobacco Products Directive regulates the content and labelling of tobacco products in the EU. The European Commission is exploring the merits of introducing plain packaging as part of the revision of the Directive. Last year the Australian government decided to introduce legislation to make plain packaging mandatory on all tobacco products as of 2012.

Plain packaging includes the removal of all attractive promotional aspects on tobacco product packaging. Except for the brand name (which would be presented in a standardized way) all other trademarks, logos, color schemes and graphics would be prohibited. The package itself would be required to be plain colored and to display only information (such as health warnings) required by law.

A number of studies on plain packaging report the same results (22,23,24):

- Plain cigarette packs are less attractive than the current ones
- Plain cigarette packs reduce the promotional appeal of the packs
- Plain cigarette packs enhance the visibility of the health warnings.

Large (80%) picture warnings should be placed on the front and back of all tobacco products in combination with standardised/plain packaging. The pictures should be renewed on regular basis, with the aim that the whole pack would become a platform for mandatory health promotion messages

On the basis of the research reviewed in our introduction, and our results, there are some serious shortcomings in tobacco control in Europe at the moment. There is an urgent need for more investment. In the EU only the UK spent €1 per capita per year on tobacco control. The 2004 ASPECT report recommended that EU member states immediately increase per capita spending by €1-3 (25).

No European country had banned smoking in bars and restaurants by January 2004. By January 2011 sixteen countries had introduced smoke-free bars and restaurants and more countries are planning to do so. The most comprehensive European smokefree legislation (a complete ban on smoking at the workplace - including bars and restaurants - with no exemptions at all) has been introduced in Ireland, Scotland, England and Turkey. Genuinely comprehensive smokefree legislation, which includes a total ban in all work places (including bars and restaurants), public places (including health and educational facilities) and public transport, should be a priority for every European country.

## Recommendations

On the basis of our results and the discussion above we have six recommendations for implementation by 2015.

1. Tobacco control programmes should be comprehensive and should include at least the six measures described in the introduction. A comprehensive tobacco control policy is an obligation under Article 4 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC).
2. Countries should spend a minimum of €2 per capita per year on tobacco control.
3. Countries should introduce comprehensive smokefree legislation in line with the guidelines on Article 8 of the WHO FCTC. It should include a total ban on smoking in work and public places, including bars, restaurants, health and educational facilities, and public transport (without exceptions and without smoking rooms).
4. Regular increases in tobacco taxes should be policy at EU and member state level.
5. Large (80%) mandatory picture warnings at the front and back of all tobacco products in combination with standardised/plain packaging,
6. Countries should address tobacco industry interference in public health policies in accordance with the guidelines on article 5.3 of the WHO FCTC.

## References

1. Joossens L, Raw M. The Tobacco Control Scale. a new scale to measure country activity. *Tobacco Control* 2006;15:247-253.  
Text: <http://tc.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/full/15/3/247>  
PDF: <http://tc.bmjournals.com/cgi/reprint/15/3/247>
2. World Bank. Tobacco control at a glance. Washington DC, 2003.  
[www.worldbank.org/tobacco](http://www.worldbank.org/tobacco)
3. Joossens L. Effective tobacco control policies in 28 European countries. Brussels, European Network for Smoking Prevention, 2004.
4. Joossens L, Raw M. Progress in Tobacco Control in 30 European countries 2005-2007. Berne, Swiss Cancer League, 2007.
5. European Commission. Excise duty tables. Ref 1.031. Directorate General Taxation and Customs Union Tax Policy, Brussels, July 2010.
6. Eurostat. Statistical Office of the European Union.  
<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home/> (accessed 10 January 2011)
7. Commission of the European Communities. Report on the implementation of the Tobacco Advertising Directive. Brussels, 25 May 2008.
8. World Health Organization. WHO Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2009.
9. European Network on Smoking and Tobacco Prevention. Implementation of EU ad ban directives, status in April 2009. Brussels, European Network on Smoking and Tobacco Prevention, 2009.
10. European Network on Smoking and Tobacco Prevention. European trends towards smokefree provisions. Brussels, European Network on Smoking Prevention, January 2011.
11. European Commission. Implementation of smokefree laws in the EU. Brussels, May 2010.
12. European Commission. Eurobarometer 332, Special Tobacco, Brussels, 2010.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_332\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_332_en.pdf) (accessed 20 February 2011)
13. Canadian Cancer Society. Cigarette package health warnings, International status report. Ottawa, Canadian Cancer Society, November 2010.
14. Bridgehead International, EQUIPP: Europe Quitting - Progress and Pathways, London, 2011
15. Martínez-Sánchez JM, Fernández E, Fu M, Gallus S, Martínez C, et al. 2010 Smoking Behaviour, Involuntary Smoking, Attitudes towards Smoke-Free Legislations, and Tobacco Control Activities in the European Union. *PLoS ONE* 5(11): e13881. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013881
16. Schaap MM, Kunst AE, Leinsalu M, Regidor E, Ekholm O, et al. Effect of nationwide tobacco control policies on smoking cessation in high and low educated groups in 18 European countries. *Tobacco Control* 2008;17: 248–55.
17. Hublet A, Schmid H, Clays E, Godeau E, Gabhainn SN, et al. Association between tobacco control policies and smoking behaviour among adolescents in 29 European countries. *Addiction* 2009;104: 1918–26.
18. Tual S, Piau J-P, Jarvis M, Dautzenberg B, Annesi-Maesano I. Impact of tobacco control policies on exhaled carbon monoxide in non-smokers. *Journal*

- of Epidemiology and Community Health, 2010;64: 554-556.
19. Anonymous. Coming of Age. Tobacco Reporter, pp 74-78, September 2010.
  20. HM Government. A smokefree future. A comprehensive tobacco control strategy for England. London, HMSO, 2010.  
[http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod\\_consum\\_dh/groups/dh\\_digitalassets/@dh/@en/@ps/documents/digitalasset/dh\\_111789.pdf](http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/@dh/@en/@ps/documents/digitalasset/dh_111789.pdf)
  21. Morgan Stanley. Tobacco. Late to the party. 30 January 2007.
  22. Wakefield M, Germain D, Durkin S. [How does increasingly plainer cigarette packaging influence adult smokers' perceptions about brand image? An experimental study](#). Tobacco Control 2008; 17: 416-421.
  23. Van Hal G et al. Which incentives make adolescents choose plain or ordinary cigarette packages? Antwerp, University of Antwerp, 2010.
  24. Moodie C, Hastings GB. Plain packaging: a time for action. European Journal of Public Health 2010; 20:10-11.
  25. Gallopel-Morvan et al. L'impact des paquets génériques et des avertissements sanitaires sur les Français – résultats des études qualitatives et quantitatives. Rapport pour L'Institut National du Cancer, 2009.
  26. The ASPECT Consortium. Tobacco or health in the European Union. Past, present and future. Brussels, European Commission, 2004 (page 228).  
[http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/health/ph\\_determinants/life\\_style/Tobacco/ev\\_20041022\\_en.htm](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/health/ph_determinants/life_style/Tobacco/ev_20041022_en.htm)

## Appendix 1. The Tobacco Control Scale, 2005

<b>Price of cigarettes and other tobacco products</b>	<b>30</b>
Price of Marlboro, and price of most popular price category, in January 2005 – additive	
The price of Marlboro in January 2005, taking into account Gross Domestic Product per capita expressed in Purchasing Power Standards (PPS). Country with highest price ratio receives 15 points. (see notes)	15
The price of a packet of cigarettes in the most popular price category in January 2005, taking into account Gross Domestic Product per capita expressed in the PPS. Country with highest price ratio receives 15 points.	15
<b>Smoke free work and other public places on 1 July 2005</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Workplaces excluding cafes and restaurants – one only of</b>	<b>10</b>
Complete ban without exceptions (no smoking rooms); enforced	10
Complete ban, but with closed, ventilated, designated smoking rooms; enforced	8
Complete ban, but with ventilated, designated smoking rooms; enforced	6
Meaningful restrictions; enforced	4
Legislation, but not enforced	2
<b>Cafes and restaurants – one only of</b>	<b>8</b>
Complete ban; enforced	8
Complete ban, but with closed, ventilated, designated smoking rooms; enforced	6
Meaningful restrictions; enforced	4
Legislation, but not enforced	2
<b>Public transport and other public places – additive</b>	<b>4</b>
Complete ban in domestic trains without exceptions	1
Complete ban in other public transport without exceptions	1
Complete ban in educational, health, government and cultural places without exceptions	2
<b>OR</b> Ban in educational, health, government and cultural places, but with designated smoking areas or rooms	1
<b>Spending on public information campaigns in 2004</b>	<b>15</b>
Tobacco control spending by the government in 2004, as a proportion of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Country with highest ratio receives 15 points (see notes).	
<b>Comprehensive bans on advertising and promotion on 1 July 2005</b>	<b>13</b>
Points for each type of ban included – additive	
Complete ban on tobacco advertising on television	3
Complete ban on outdoor advertising (eg. posters)	2
Complete ban on advertising in print media (eg. newspapers and magazines)	2
Complete ban on indirect advertising (eg. cigarette branded clothes, watches, etc)	2
Ban on point of sale advertising	1
Ban on cinema advertising	1
Ban on sponsorship	1
Ban on internet advertising	½
Ban on radio advertising	½
<b>Large direct health warning labels on 1 July 2005</b>	<b>10</b>
Rotating health warnings	2
Size of warning – one only of	4

10% or less of packet	1
11 – 25% of packet	2
26 – 40% of packet	3
41% or more of packet	4
Contrasting colour (eg. black lettering on white background)	1
A picture	3
<b>Treatment to help dependent smokers stop</b>	<b>10</b>
Quitline – <b>one only</b> of	2
Well funded national quitline or well funded quitlines in all major regions of country	2
<b>OR</b> National quitline with limited funding or a patch work of small local quitlines	1
Network of smoking cessation support	3
Reimbursement of treatment	3
Cessation support network covering whole country (3); free (3)	6
Cessation support network, but only in selected areas, eg. major cities (2); free (3)	5
Cessation support network covering whole country (3), partially free (2)	5
Cessation support network, but very limited, just a few centres (1), free (3)	4
Cessation support network, but only in selected areas, eg. major cities (2), partially free (2)	4
Cessation support network covering whole country (3), not free (0)	3
Cessation support network, but very limited, just a few centres (1), partially free (2)	3
Cessation support network, but only in selected areas, eg. major cities (2); not free (0)	2
Cessation support network, just a few centres (1), not free (0)	1
Reimbursement of medications – <b>one only</b> of	2
Reimbursement of pharmaceutical treatment products	2
<b>OR</b> Partial reimbursement of pharmaceutical treatment products	1
<b>Maximum possible score</b>	<b>100</b>

Table notes. **Cigarette price:** Gross Domestic Product can be expressed in PPS (purchasing Power Standard). PPS per capita has been used to take account of real purchasing power in different countries; points are awarded using the same method as for public information campaign spending. **Public information campaign spending:** the top country, the UK, is awarded 15 points; the UK ratio (spending/GDP) is then divided by 15 and the resulting number gets 1 point; countries achieve points for multiples of that number. **Advertising:** television is the medium most used for tobacco advertising in countries with no advertising restrictions; outdoor advertising (eg. posters) is a prominently used medium when television advertising is banned; indirect advertising (eg. clothing, watches, or other products with cigarette branding, is the industry's favoured loophole when there are otherwise comprehensive advertising bans.

**Why rankings for price and spending?** PPS takes account of affordability within a country. This introduces a (constantly changing) ratio, rather than absolute figures. In order to simplify this abstract ratio ranking system, we attributed the highest score to the country with the highest ratio. The method is best understood by consulting the raw data and resulting points scored, on the website.

## Appendix 2. Smokefree public places - score on 1 January 2011 in 31 European countries

Country	Bars and restaurants (max=8)	Public transport (trains, busses, subway) (max=2)	Public places (educational, health, governmental, theatres) (max=2)	Work Place (max=10)	Total (max=22)
Ireland	8	2	1	10	21
UK	8	2	1	10	21
Turkey	8	2	1	10	21
Iceland	8	2	1	6	17
Norway	8	2	1	6	17
Spain	8 (1)	2	1	6 (11)	17
France	6	2	1	8	17
Italy	6	2	1	8	17
Finland	6	2	1	8	17
Sweden	6	2	1	6	15
Slovenia	6	2	1	6	15
Malta	5 (2)	2	1	6	14
Latvia	8	1	1	4	14
NL	4 (3)	2	1	6	13
Belgium	4 (4)	2	1	6	13
Estonia	6	1	1	4	12
Lithuania	6	1	1	4	12
Denmark	4	2	1	4	11
Germany	4 (5)	2	1	4	11
Portugal	4	2	1	4	11
Cyprus	6 (6)	2	1	2	11
Poland	4 (7)	2	1	4 (12)	11
Switzerl	4 (8)	2	1	4	11
Lux	4	2	1	4	11
Slovakia	4	1	1	4	10
Austria	2	2	1	2	7
Romania	2	2	1	2 (13)	7
Greece	2 (9)	2	1	2	7
Czech R.	2	2	1	2	7
Hungary	2	1	1	2	6
Bulgaria	2 (10)	1	1	2	6

(1) New smoke free legislation in bars and restaurants (no exemptions, no smoking rooms) came into force on 2 January 2011. It is too soon to evaluate the compliance with the new legislation.

(2) Enforcement remains a problem in bars in Malta. 51% of those who visited a bar in Malta have seen people smoking inside. (source: eurobarometer nr 332, May 2010). The five score is an average of scores six and four.

(3) On 3 November 2010 the government modified its legislation and lifted the smoking ban

for bars of 70 m<sup>2</sup> or less which did not employ any staff other than the owner. As a result, many cafés allow smoking. Accordance to the Ministry of Health, the ban in restaurants is well enforced.

(4) Ban on smoking in indoor public places with the exception of separate smoking rooms. Since 1 January 2010 smoking is no longer allowed in cafés where food is served. Exception: smoking is allowed in cafés, casinos and bars that only serve packaged foods which are non perishable for at least three months.

(5) Legislation of smoking in bars and restaurants is a competence of the regions (länder). Most länder ban smoking in bars and restaurants, but may allow smoking rooms or some exceptions. Bavaria adopted the most stringent smoke free legislation (no exemptions, no smoking rooms) as result of a referendum on the 4<sup>th</sup> July 2010, which an approval rate of 61%.

(6) Cyprus adopted comprehensive smoke free legislation in bars and restaurants (no smoking rooms, no exemptions) which came into force on 1 January 2010, but compliance is a major concern in bars, pubs and disco's. (source: Press Office, Cyprus Police, January 2011) The six score is an average of scores eight and four.

(7) On 15 November 2010 the latest amendment to Polish tobacco control legislation (mainly focusing on new smoke-free regulations) came into force. The new law allows exceptions, for instance for drinking and eating establishments with two or more rooms.

(8) Legislation of smoking in bars of restaurants is a competence of the cantons. (Similar to Germany). A majority of the cantons apply smoke free legislation in bars and restaurants.

(9) Greece adopted new legislation in bars and restaurants (with exemptions) which came into force on 1 September 2010. Compliance with the smoke free legislation has been a huge problem in Greece, which has not changed with the law. (see for instance: Eight in 10 smokers violate smoking ban, Toronto Sun, 8 October 2010)

(10) New partial smoke free legislation in public spaces (including bars and restaurants) came into force on 1 January 2011. Press article indicate that the new law was widely ignored. (see for instance: Smoking ban widely ignored in Bulgaria, Novinite, 5 January 2011)

(11) The Spanish smoke free legislation at the workplace came into force in 2006. It does not allow smoking rooms or contain exceptions. However, enforcement could improve. In 2009, only 58% of those who work indoors in Spain said that they were never or almost never exposed to tobacco indoor smoke at the workplace (source: eurobarometer nr 332, May 2010). The six score is an average of scores eight and two

(12) Poland has smoke free legislation at the work place, which allows smoking rooms. Compliance remains a problem. Only 61% of those who work indoors in Poland said that they were never or almost never exposed to tobacco indoor smoke at the workplace (source: eurobarometer nr 332, May 2010) The four score is an average of scores six and two.

(13) Romania has smoke free legislation, but allows exceptions (for instance in rooms occupied by one person). The legislation came into force on 1 January 2009. Compliance remains a problem. Only 57% of those who work indoors in Romania said that they were never or almost never exposed to tobacco indoor smoke at the workplace (source: eurobarometer nr 332, May 2010)

**Appendix 3. Smoke-free legislation compliance based on Eurobarometer 332 (fieldwork October 2009)**

Country	No person was smoking during the last visit in the last 6 months in bars	No person was smoking during the last visit in the last 6 months in restaurants	Never or almost never exposed to tobacco smoke at your work place
Sweden	87%	90%	96%
Ireland	91%	94%	90%
UK	89%	91%	90%
Finland	84%	90%	89%
Denmark	57%	85%	88%
Slovenia	88%	94%	88%
NL	11%	20%	87%
Germany	50%	82%	85%
Lux	17%	87%	83%
Portugal	60%	82%	81%
Latvia	63%	82%	81%
Italy	86%	90%	79%
France	78%	88%	79%
Belgium	21%	80%	79%
Turkey	74 %	78 %	78%
Slovakia	35%	70%	78%
Estonia	77%	84%	78%
Malta	51%	81%	75%
Lithuania	77%	87%	73%
Czech R.	22%	37%	72%
Poland	39%	56%	61%
Spain	7%	14%	58%
Romania	14%	33%	57%
Hungary	21%	57%	55%
Bulgaria	4%	8%	55%
Austria	14%	29%	53%
Cyprus	2%	7%	48%
Greece	21%	27%	39%

**Appendix 4. Bans on tobacco advertising - score on 1 January 2011 in 31 European countries**

Country	T V / r a d i o	Cine - Ma 1	Out- door	print	point of sales	Dis- play	Spon- sor nat.	spon- sor inter	inter - net (1)	in- direct	Stan- tardized packs	total
Maximum of points	2	1	2	1,5	1	2	0,5	0,5	0,5	1	1	13
Ireland	2	1	2	1,5	1	2	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	12
Iceland	2	1	2	1,5	1	2	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	12
Norway	2	1	2	1,5	1	2	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	12
Finland	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	10
Sweden	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	10
Estonia	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	10
Cyprus	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	10
Malta	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	10
Bulgaria	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	10
Lux	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
NL	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
Spain	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
France	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
UK	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
Poland	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
Slovenia	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
Slovakia	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	1	0	9
Latvia	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	?	0	0	9
Lithuania	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	1	0	8
Italy	2	1	2	1,5	1	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	8
Portugal	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	0	0	8
Belgium	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	0	0	8
Denmark	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	0	0	8
Czech R.	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0,5	0,5	?	0	0	8
Austria	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	7
Romania	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	7
Turkey	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	7
Hungary	2	1	2	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	7
Greece	2	0	2	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	6
Germany	2	0	0	1,5	0	0	0	0,5	?	0	0	4
Switzerl	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	2

(1) We have put a question mark in the column of internet advertising for all countries , as the enforcement of this ban is difficult to monitor

### Appendix 5. Label score on 1 January 2011 in 31 European countries

Country	Size (max= 3 points)	Pictorial health warnings( max= 3 points)	Plain packaging (4 points)	Total (max=10)
Turkey	2	3		5
Switzerland	2	3		5
UK	1	3		4
Belgium	2	2		4
Denmark	1			1
Latvia	1	2		3
Romania	1	2		3
Ireland	2			2
Finland	2			2
Bulgaria	1			1
Germany	1			1
Greece	1			1
Spain	1			1
France	1			1
Italy	1			1
Lux	1			1
NL	1			1
Austria	1			1
Portugal	1			1
Sweden	1			1
Czech R.	1			1
Estonia	1			1
Cyprus	1			1
Lithuania	1			1
Hungary	1			1
Malta	1			1
Poland	1			1
Slovenia	1			1
Slovakia	1			1
Iceland	1			1
Norway	1			1

## Appendix 6. Tobacco Control Budget (TCB) score in 2009 in 31 European countries

Country	Population 1000s 2009	Tobacco control budget in national currency 2009 thousands	Tobacco control budget € 2009 thousands	Ex- change rate euro 2009	Tobacco control budget 2009 per capita €	GDP In PPS EU= 100	Tobacco Control Budget Per capita PPS 2009	TBC score Max= 15
Switzerl.	7 701	20 550 CHF	13 609 €	1.51	1.77	143	1.23	9
Iceland	319	77 000 ISK	446 €	127.67	1.40	122	1.15	9
UK	61 595	62 000 GBP	69 663 €	0.89	1.13	112	1.00	8
Denmark	5 511	17 000 DKK	2 285 €	7.44	0.41	121	0.34	3
Finland	5 326	1 500 €	1 500		0.28	113	0.25	2
Belgium	10 753	2 875 €	2 875 €	1	0.27	116	0.23	2
Sweden	9 256	27 020 SEK	2 544 €	10.62	0.27	118	0.23	2
Norway	4 799	15 100 NOK	1 722 €	8.77	0.36	178	0.20	2
Spain	45 828	4 293 €	4 293 €	1	0.09	103	0.09	1
NL	16 485	4 050 €	4 050 €		0.25	131	0.19	1
France	64366	5 200 000 €	5 200 €	1	0.08	108	0.07	1
Ireland	4 450	625 €	625 €		0.14	127	0.11	1
Latvia	2 261	15 LVL	21, 428 €	0.70	0.01	52	0.02	
Estonia	1 340	833 EEK	53, 227€	15.65	0.03	64	0.05	
Malta	413					81		
Italy	60 045	3 890 €	3 890 €		0.06	104	0.06	
Romania	21 498	1 860 LEU	44,165 €	4.21	0.002	46	0.004	
Lux	493	92 €	92 €		0.18	271	0.06	
Austria	8 355	600 €	600 €		0.07	124	0.06	
Portugal	10 627	-	-		-	80		
Czech R.	10 467	200 CZK	0,757 €	26.43	-	82		
Cyprus	796	-				98		
Lithuania	3 349	20 LTL	5,8 €	3.45	0.002	55	0.004	
Hungary	10 030	15 000 HUF	53,508 €	280.33	0.005	65	0.008	
Poland	38 135	1 000 PLN	231,5 €	4.32	0.01	61	0.02	
Slovenia	2032					88		
Slovakia	5 412	16,5 €	16, 5 €		-	73		
Germany	82 002	-	-		-	116		
Greece	11 260	-	-		-	93		
Bulgaria	7 606	-	-		-	44		
Turkey	71 517	-	-		-	47		

## Appendix 7. Cigarette price score 1 July 2010 in 31 European countries

Country	Currency	Exchange rate to Euro: 1 July 2010	Retail price cigarettes Most Popular Price Category July 2010 €	Price MPPC July 2010 To PPS Per capita	PPS per capita 2009 EU= 100	Price Marlboro € July 2010	Marlboro to PPS Per capita	Marlboro + MPPC to PPS per capita	Score prices (Max 30)
IE	€	1	8.5	6.69	127	8.55	6.73	13.42	27
UK	GBP	0.82	6.91	6.16	112	7.46	6.66	12.82	26
NO	NOK	8.05	11.24	6.31	178	11.24	6.31	12.62	25
TR	TRY	1.96	2.30	4.89	47	3.57	7.60	12.49	25
BU	BGN	1.96	2.11	4.80	44	2.55	5.79	10.59	21
FR	€	1	5.60	5.19	108	5.60	5.19	10.38	21
RO	RON	4.34	2.32	5.04	46	2.51	5.46	10.50	21
IS	ISK		5.80	4.92	118	5.80	4.92	9.84	20
MT	€	1	4	4.94	81	3.80	4.69	9.63	19
LV	LVL	0.71	2.15	4.13	52	2.60	5	9.13	18
PT	€	1	3.50	4.38	80	3.70	4.63	9.01	18
SE	€	1	4.91	4.16	118	5.26	4.46	8.62	17
DE	€	1	4.95	4.27	116	4.95	4.27	8.54	17
LT	LTL	3.45	2.20	4	55	2.54	4.62	8.62	17
FI	€	1	4.40	3.89	113	5.00	4.42	8.31	17
BE	€	1	4.84	4.17	116	4.95	4.27	8.44	17
DK	DKK	7.4552	4.96	4.10	121	4.96	4.10	8.20	16
IT	€	1	3.70	3.56	104	4.50	4.33	7.89	16
NL	€	1	5.05	3.85	131	5.05	3.85	7.70	16
EL	€	1	3.20	3.44	93	3.80	4.09	7.53	15
CH	CHF	1.32	5.30	3.68	144	5.30	3.68	7.36	15
HU	HUF	287	2.26	3.48	65	2.60	4	7.48	15
SK	€	1	2.42	3.32	73	3.16	4.33	7.65	15
PO	PLN	4.18	1.87	3.07	61	2.56	4.20	7.27	15
CY	€	1	2.82	2.88	98	3.85	3.93	6.81	14
CZ	CZK	25.8	2.47	3.01	82	3.18	3.88	6.89	14
ES	€	1	3.40	3.30	103	3.80	3.69	6.99	14
EE	EEK	15.6	2.04	3.19	64	2.55	3.98	7.17	14
AT	€	1	4	3.23	124	4.20	3.39	6.62	13
SI	€	1	2.50	2.84	88	3.00	3.41	6.25	13
LU	€	1	3.04	1.12	271	4.20	1.55	2.67	5

## Appendix 8. Treatment score in 2010 in 31 European countries

Country	Recording Smoking status	Brief advice	Quitline	Network Cessation Support	Reimbursement	Total
Maximum scores	1	1	2	4	2	10
UK	1	1	2	4	1	9
Denmark		1	2	4		7
Lux		1	2	3	1	7
Romania	1		2	3	1	7
Poland	1	1	2	3		7
Switzel		1	2	3		6
NL		1	2	3		6
Belgium		1	1	3	1	6
France			2	3	1	6
Malta	1		2	3		6
Sweden			2	3	1	6
Slovenia	1		1	4		6
Estonia			2	4		6
Ireland			2	3	1	6
Slovakia		1	1	4		6
Italy			2	3		5
Portugal			2	3		5
Hungary			2	3		5
Norway		1	2	2		5
Czech R.			1	3		4
Austria			2	2		4
Germany			2	2		4
Finland			1	3		4
Spain	1			3		4
Cyprus			1	2	1	4
Turkey				3		3
Lithuania			1	2		3
Iceland			1	1		2
Greece			1	2		3
Bulgaria				2		2
Latvia						0