

# Public consultation on the implementation of an EU system for traceability and security features pursuant to Articles 15 and 16 of the Tobacco Products Directive 2014/40/EU

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

This is a public consultation on the implementation of an EU system for traceability and security features for tobacco products, as required under Articles 15 and 16 of the Tobacco Products Directive 2014/40/EU (TPD). The purpose of this consultation is to seek comments from the general public and interested parties, such as consumers, retailers of finished tobacco products, manufacturers of finished tobacco products, wholesalers and distributors of finished tobacco products, providers of solutions for operating traceability, security feature or data storage systems, and governmental and non-governmental organisations active in the area of tobacco control and the fight against illicit trade.

The basis for the consultation is the Commission's [Inception Impact Assessment](#). This document develops the main policy options currently under consideration for implementing the system for traceability and security features provided for under Articles 15 and 16 TPD. These policy options are outlined in Table 4 of the Inception Impact Assessment (page 8).

As the objective of this public consultation is, among others, to gain confirmation or otherwise of the assumptions made regarding the policy options mentioned above, **those participating are strongly advised to review the Inception Impact Assessment before responding**. The comments received in the course of this consultation will provide input for the ongoing implementation work on the future EU system.

Stakeholders are invited to submit their responses to this consultation via the survey form below until **4 November 2016**.

The survey form consists of closed and open questions. For open questions stakeholders will be asked to provide comments up to the limit of characters indicated in the question. Submissions

should - where possible - be in English.

In the case of corporate groups, one single reply should be prepared. For responses from governmental organisations not representing a national position, the reply should explain why the responding body is directly affected by the envisaged measures.

The information received will be treated in accordance with Regulation 45/2001 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community (please see [here](#) for information on rules governing personal data protection and consult the [privacy statement](#) provided on the consultation webpage). In the case of submissions by corporate groups, respondents are asked not to upload personal data of individuals.

Please note that organisations falling under the following respondent groups should register in the [Transparency Register](#) before they begin to answer the questions:

- Manufacturers of tobacco products destined for consumers (finished tobacco products)
- Operators involved in the supply chain of finished tobacco products (excluding retail)
- Providers of solutions for operating traceability, security features or data storage
- Non-Governmental Organisations

The submissions of non-registered organisations will be published separately from those of registered ones and considered as the input of individuals.

The Commission reserves the right to contact you to request further explanation and/or justification of your calculations and/or the reasoning on which your responses rely. You may also be requested to provide further evidence for your detailed replies.

Answers that do not comply with the overall specifications outlined above cannot be considered.

## A. Respondent details

---

\*A1. Please identify which respondent group you fall under:

- a) Consumer/member of the general public
- b) Retailer of finished tobacco products
- c) Manufacturer of tobacco products destined for consumers (finished tobacco products)
- d) Operator involved in the supply chain of finished tobacco products (excluding retail)
- e) Provider of solutions for traceability, security features or data storage
- f) Governmental organisation
- g) NGO
- h) Other organisation

If you fall under groups **b)**, **c)**, **d)** or **e)** above, please indicate if you are a small or medium sized enterprise as defined in [Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC](#) (i.e. an enterprise which employs fewer than 250 persons and which has an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million.)

- Yes
- No

If other, please specify

*Text of 1 to 800 characters will be accepted*

A3. If you fall under respondent group **b)** above, please indicate the tobacco products you retail (multiple response options possible):

- Cigarettes
- Roll-Your-Own tobacco
- Cigarillos
- Cigars
- Pipe tobacco
- Water pipe tobacco
- Smokeless tobacco including chewing, oral and nasal tobacco
- Other

If other, please specify

*Text of 1 to 800 characters will be accepted*

A5. If you fall under respondent group **d)** above, please indicate your main area(s) of activity:

- Importer
- Distributor
- Wholesaler
- Warehouse operator
- Other



Please carefully read the [Inception Impact Assessment](#) document before answering the questionnaire

### Questions on the governance model

\* C1. Out of the three governance models outlined in the Inception Impact Assessment for the traceability system for tobacco products, which one do you consider most suitable for operating the traceability system from your perspective:

- Option A1: industry operated solution
- Option A2: third party operated solution
- Option A3: mixed solution (industry and third party)
- No opinion

\* C2. Do you agree that the industry operated model (option A1) will require, on the part of the public authorities, additional control measures to ensure traceability of tobacco products?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C3. Do you consider that traceability of tobacco products can only be achieved on condition that the supply chain is controlled by a third party independent from the tobacco industry?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C4. If options A1 and A2 are to be compared in terms of their overall impact on cost per pack of product (excluding potential additional costs for the public authorities related to monitoring and enforcement in option A1), do you consider\*

- Option A1 to be cheaper than option A2
- Both options to have the same cost impact
- Option A1 to be more expensive than option A2
- No opinion

*\*Subquestion a) to question C4: What is your estimate of the average likely increase in the cost of a pack of product that would be incurred in establishing and operating the traceability system under option A1 (in Euro, ex-factory level, before taxes. If relevant please indicate an exchange rate)? Please outline your justifications/reasoning for this estimate including a clear indication of your sources of information. If needed please indicate how your estimate may differ for different categories of products*

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

As we are a small company importing lot of smaller cigar brands, for us the third party operated solution is the only way to go. The smaller manufacturers of cigars will definitely not be dealing with any IT infrastructure related to traceability, security systems, printing technologies and so on. They do not have any resources to do that. Using solution operated by someone else from tobacco industry is not possible due to the fact that the manufacturers and importers will not want to share information about movements of tobacco products with another commercial entity from tobacco industry. Thus the burden of running such a system would fall on importers. Most of the companies importing cigars in Europe are small businesses and they do not have the resources as well to operate the solution. So for small businesses, the A1 is completely unsuitable from our point of view.

*\*Subquestion b) to question C4: What is your estimate of the average likely increase in the cost of a pack of product incurred in establishing and operating the traceability system under option A2 (in Euro, ex-factory level, before taxes. If relevant please indicate an exchange rate)?*

*Please outline your justifications/reasoning for this estimate including a clear indication of your sources of information. If needed please indicate how your estimate may differ for different categories of products*

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

As mentioned above, we are a small company dealing with lot of small cigar manufacturers. That means that most of the effort related to introducing products to the market is done manually. This already includes: sticking HWs (front and back or inside), sticking tax stamp, reporting net weight of tobacco included in the package to government (specific to Slovak legislation). The traceability requirement would mean the following additional efforts to us:

1. Sticking some security feature that would bear the unique id on the consumer packaging
2. Scanning the data carrier and reporting it to the system when the goods are leaving our company

In addition to these increased efforts, one-time cost would be incurred as well - additional equipment for scanning the data carrier and some cost would be associated with introduction of such a process, including cost related to integration or learning how to use the traceability system.

The additional efforts might cost us as much as 0.40 EUR per package (mainly cost of manual labor). One time costs are hard to estimate given that it depends on the choices that will be done on a technical side.

\* C5. Do you agree that a mixed model of governance, in which the choice of governance is separately made with respect to each distinct technological block/process (e.g. generation, printing/affixing and visual control of a unique identifier) can both provide for full traceability of tobacco products and mitigate the overall public-private cost of establishing and operating the system?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

C6. Would you like to add any comments or suggestions on the choice of the governance model?

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

As SME, I believe that there must be possibility to use some solution run by third party. Small business dealing with importing of cigars and pipe tobaccos will not be able to operate their own solution and they will not want to use solution possibly operated by other players in tobacco industry. Bigger corporations might make their choice based on what are their needs, however SMEs should be provided with some easy to use solution that would not burden them too much.

**Questions on the data storage location**

\* C7. Out of the two data storage locations outlined in the Inception Impact Assessment, which option do you consider most suitable from your perspective:

- Option B1: centralised data storage
- Option B2: decentralised data storage
- No opinion

\* C8. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 12) that centralised data storage can provide for important economies of scale (construed as savings in costs gained by an increased level of centralisation), in particular given the related costs of interconnectivity and interoperability present in the option of decentralised data storage?\*

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

*\*Subquestion to question C8: Please provide the reasoning for your response*

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

The question is what does the decentralisation means. If there will be single point of entry for SMEs, it does not really matter whether it will be centralised or not. For us, as a user of the solution, the important point is that decentralisation should be hidden. I can hardly imagine reporting to different data storages based on manufacturer of the product or country of origin or destination country.

\* C9. Which type of data storage represents higher risks in terms of time required to access data and/or potential downtimes?\*

- Centralised data storage
- Decentralised data storage
- No opinion

\* C10. In the case of a decentralised data storage, how should data be split among individual data storages:

- Geographic decentralisation with regional/national data storages
- Product decentralisation with all the data on a single product stored in one place
- Other option
- No opinion

\* C11. If the option of geographic decentralisation of data storages is considered, the relevant data on a given product should be placed

- In the storage of the region/country of product origin
- In the storage of the region/country of intended retail market
- In all the regional/national data storages of a given product's presence, incl. transit countries
- No opinion

*\*Subquestion to question C11: Please provide the reasoning for your response*

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

I believe that the products are moved between the countries in big quantities (i.e. units) and inside the countries where the products are distributed, smaller quantities are moved around. That means that there is less data to report before the product get to the intended market comparing with what happens afterwards. Thus the biggest network traffic will be caused by companies in local supply chain reporting lot of movements in the local market. From our point of view it makes it very natural to cluster the data by intended market.

C12. Would you like to add any comments or suggestions on the choice of the data storage location?

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

### Questions on the allowed data carriers

\* C13. Out of the three options for data carriers outlined in the Inception Impact Assessment which one do you consider most suitable for operating the traceability system from your perspective

- Option C1: system with a single data carrier
- Option C2: system with a limited variety of data carriers
- Option C3: free system allowing any existing data carrier
- No opinion

\* C14. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 12) that a system with a single data carrier may offer insufficient flexibility in view of different requirements of various economic operators, including small and medium enterprises?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C15. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 12) that a free system (allowing any existing data carrier) introduces a risk that certain data carriers will not be readable by all the scanners installed in the system and that its functioning would require frequent updates of the scanners, which may not be technically feasible and/or economically viable?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

*\*Subquestion to question C15: Please provide the reasoning for your response*

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

If there is no limitation as to what standards the carrier should fulfil, anyone can come up with new carrier and of course existing infrastructure will not be sufficient to work with it.

C16. Would you like to add any comments or suggestions on the choice of the allowed data carriers?

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

As SME, we do not really care whether there will be one or thousand different carriers. The key point for us is that there should be a single scanner covering all standard carriers. Having different scanners for different carriers / manufacturers / countries of origin / etc. would be a nightmare.

### **Questions on the allowed delays in reporting events**

\* C17. Out of the three options for the allowed delays in reporting events outlined in the Inception Impact Assessment, which one do you consider most suitable for operating the traceability system from your perspective:

- Option D1: real-time (or limited delay – max. several minutes – reports)
- Option D2: once daily reports
- Option D3: once weekly reports
- No opinion

\* C18. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 12) that option D1, which envisages real-time reporting (or limited delays of maximum several minutes), would be particularly efficient to track products in transit as it would avoid duplicating scanning operations (e.g. by both a dispatcher/recipient and a transport operator)?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C19. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 12) that option D1 (real-time or limited delays of maximum several minutes) would support effective realtime risk analysis so that controls by competent authorities can be better targeted on illicit trade?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C20. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 13) that the once-daily frequency of data uploads provides for important cost savings for the economic operators as compared to the option of real-time reporting (or limited delays of maximum several minutes)?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C21. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 13) that the once-weekly frequency of data uploads provides for important cost savings for the economic operators as compared to the option of once-daily reporting?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

C22. Would you like to add any comments or suggestions on the choice of the allowed delays in reporting events?

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

**Questions on the method of adding a security feature**

\* C23. Out of the three options for the method of adding a security feature that are outlined in the Inception Impact Assessment which one do you consider most suitable for securing the product from your perspective?

- Option S1: affixing
- Option S2: printing or integrating through a different method
- Option S3: any method
- No opinion

\* C24. Do you agree with the assumption made in the Inception Impact Assessment (p. 13) that by broadening the range of available methods, it will be easier for economic operators (including small and medium enterprises) to obtain the necessary level of security in a cost-efficient manner?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

\* C25. How do you rate the importance for consumers of having visible security features on unit packs of tobacco products?

- Important
- Rather important
- Neutral
- Rather unimportant
- Unimportant
- No opinion

\* C26. Do you consider that enabling individual consumers to decode and verify a serialized unique identifier with mobile devices (e.g. smartphones) would bring added value to the effectiveness of the tracking and tracing system?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

C27. Would you like to add any comments or suggestions on the choice of the method of adding a security feature?

*Text of 1 to 1500 characters will be accepted*

Cigar boxes are produced in a very small numbers, usually lot of manual work is involved and very limited machinery. Thus there is no way to print or integrate security feature with a reasonable cost. For cigars, security feature will always had to be affixed to the box.

C28. Please upload any additional comments on the subject of this consultation (max. 5 pages)

## **Contact**

SANTE-B2-TOBACCO-CONTROL@ec.europa.eu

---