

Appendix 1 – Recommended Response

Tobacco and vapes: packaging, appearance and display – Consultation

About you

Questions for everyone

In what capacity are you responding to this survey?

- An individual sharing my personal views and experiences
- An individual sharing my professional views
- **On behalf of an organisation**

Do you have any direct or indirect links to, or receive funding from, the tobacco industry?

- Yes
- **No**

Questions for people sharing their personal or professional views

What is your age? (Optional)

- Under 13
- 13 to 15
- 16 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 to 74
- 75 to 84
- 85 or above
- Prefer not to say

What is your sex? (Optional)

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth? (Optional)

- Yes
- No

- Prefer not to say

What is your ethnic group? (Optional)

- White - includes British, Northern Irish, Irish, Gypsy, Irish Traveller, Roma or any other White background
- Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups - includes White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian or any other Mixed or Multiple background
- Asian or Asian British - includes Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese or any other Asian background
- Black, Black British, Caribbean or African - includes Black British, Caribbean, African or any other Black background
- Other ethnic group - includes Arab or any other ethnic group
- Prefer not to say

Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last 12 months or more? (Optional)

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

If you answered 'Yes', do any of your conditions or illnesses reduce your ability to carry out day-to-day activities? (Optional)

- Yes, a lot
- Yes, a little
- Not at all
- Prefer not to say

Where do you live in the UK? (Optional)

- England
- Scotland
- Wales
- Northern Ireland
- I live outside the UK
- Prefer not to say

If you answered 'England', in which area of England do you live? (Optional)

- North East England
- North West England

- Yorkshire and the Humber
- East of England
- East Midlands
- West Midlands
- London
- South East England
- South West England
- Prefer not to say

Which of the following best describes your smoking habits (including heated tobacco use)?

- I currently smoke at least once a week
- I smoke occasionally (less than once a week)
- I used to smoke but have now quit
- I have never smoked
- Prefer not to say

Which of the following best describes your vaping habits?

- I currently vape at least once a week
- I vape occasionally (less than once a week)
- I used to vape but have now quit
- I have never vaped
- Prefer not to say

Which of the following best describes your usage of other nicotine products? For example, nicotine pouches.

- I currently use nicotine products at least once a week
- I use nicotine products occasionally (less than once a week)
- I used to use nicotine products but have now quit
- I have never used nicotine products
- Prefer not to say

Questions for people responding on behalf of an organisation

What is the size of your organisation? (Optional)

- Small (0 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more employees)

Where does your organisation operate or provide services? Select all that apply.
(Optional)

- England
- Wales
- Scotland
- **Northern Ireland**
- The whole of the UK
- Outside the UK

Please provide the name of the organisation you are responding on behalf of. (Optional)

Questions for people sharing their professional views and those responding on behalf of an organisation

What is the main area or focus of your work? (Optional)

- Academic
- Advocacy
- Distribution
- Education
- Emergency services
- Enforcement agencies
- Healthcare
- Hospitality
- Justice system
- Legal
- **Local government**
- National government
- Production or manufacturing
- Retail
- Social care
- Wholesale
- Other, please specify

Do you work for, or are you providing views on behalf of, any of the following? Select all that apply.

- Manufacturer or producer of a tobacco product
- Manufacturer or producer of a vape or nicotine product

- Importer of a tobacco product
- Importer of a vape or nicotine product
- Distributor of a tobacco product
- Distributor of a vape or nicotine product
- Retailer of a tobacco product
- Retailer of a vape or nicotine product

Or:

- None of the above

Tobacco packaging

Proposals for further plain packaging requirements

We propose to introduce plain packaging requirements for:

- all tobacco products (including but not limited to cigars, cigarillos, pipe tobacco, waterpipe tobacco, smokeless and heated tobacco)
- heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products
- cigarette papers

These requirements would broadly align with existing requirements for cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco.

An overview of the existing requirements for cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco is set out below.

Colour

Pantone 448C (drab dark brown) colour with a matt finish.

Branding

Brand name permitted once each on front, top and bottom of pack. It must:

- be in a centred position
- be in Pantone Cool Gray 2 C
- be in Helvetica font size 14 point or less
- have only the first letter capitalised

The variant name must follow the same requirements other than to be size 10 point or less and positioned immediately below the brand name.

No promotional images or logos, additional colours or markings are allowed.

Shape

Specified packaging shapes. For cigarettes this is cuboid only and for hand-rolling tobacco this is cuboid, cylindrical or pouch.

Packaging materials

Specified packaging materials. For cigarettes this is carton or soft material only.

Minimum size

20 pack for cigarettes, 30 grams for hand-rolling tobacco.

Some products may require specific plain packaging requirements, for example hand-rolling tobacco pouches are permitted to have a re-sealable sticker and cigarette packets have a lining. If we proceed with the policy, we will engage further on the details of the plain packaging measures for specific products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for all tobacco products? This does not include cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco which already have strict plain packaging requirements.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for heated tobacco devices?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for herbal smoking products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for cigarette papers?

- **Agree**

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing your views on which tobacco products plain packaging requirements should or should not be introduced for, or specific elements of our proposals which you agree or disagree with. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that all tobacco products should be subject to the same requirements as each poses a public health risk and by aligning these requirements this will help outline to the public that this is the case.

The plain packaging requirements should apply to all tobacco products as this will help reduce attractiveness to young people and those wanting to quit. It will also help ensure that the health warnings are clear and impactful while reducing loopholes for the industry to advertise.

Heated tobacco contains nicotine, which is highly addictive and has a range of harmful side effects, so any measures that can reduce uptake and supporting those wanting to quit we are supportive of. In addition, plain packaging for heated tobacco devices may make the product safety information more visible and prominent to support compliance checks and safe user awareness.

Herbal smoking products are not a safe alternative to smoking cigarettes and plain packaging will help ensure that they cannot be promoted as such.

Cigarette papers should be included as this will prevent tobacco companies from using these for marketing purposes.

Text health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices and cigarette papers

We propose to introduce text health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices and cigarette papers. All tobacco products and herbal smoking products already have these warnings. The wording of warnings will reflect the harms of using each product.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce text health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce text health warnings on the packaging of cigarette papers?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

Yes, we agree that health warnings should be included on the packaging of heated tobacco as it is vital that users are aware of the dangers associated with nicotine addiction. With the amount of tobacco products on the market consumers may not be clear what the potential health effects for heated tobacco are and this should be highlighted for users

We agree that health warnings on cigarette papers should be introduced to ensure consistency across all tobacco products and to educate smokers about the risks, assist them in wanting to quit and to help deter young people from starting to smoke.

Consideration should be given to ensure that any health warnings on packaging is not to the detriment of the required safety warnings for electronic devices, and the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements for heated tobacco devices. Any requirements should therefore ensure that sufficient space remains for all essential regulatory information.

Picture health warnings on the packaging of more products and devices

All smoked tobacco products currently require picture health warnings, excluding individually wrapped cigars and cigarillos, and packs of large cigars that weigh more than 3 grams each. These products only require text warnings on their packaging.

Smokeless tobacco products, heated tobacco devices and herbal smoking products currently do not have picture health warnings.

We propose to introduce picture warnings on the packaging of:

- all tobacco products (including all cigars and cigarillos, smokeless tobacco and heated tobacco)
- heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products

We do not propose including picture warnings for cigarette papers due to the typically smaller size of the packaging.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce picture health warnings on the packaging of all tobacco products? This builds on requirements that are already in place for most tobacco products.

- Agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce picture health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce picture health warnings on the packaging of herbal smoking products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that picture health warnings should not be required on the packaging of cigarette papers? We do not propose including picture health warnings on cigarette papers due to the small size of the packaging.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing your views on which tobacco products health warning requirements should or should not be introduced for. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that picture health warning should be introduced on the packaging of all tobacco products and herbal smoking products. Pictorial warnings are more likely to be noticed than text-only warning and are a cost-effective way to educate smokers about the health risks. In addition, graphic visual warnings may also prevent young people from starting to smoke and help motivate those wanting to quit. Where possible combining picture health warnings, along with text is an impactful way to highlight the message.

Some promotion of herbal smoking has attempted to show these are safer than traditional smoking and it is important to highlight the risks to both current and potential future users.

If health warnings are to be introduced it should not be to the detriment of the required safety warnings for electronic devices, and the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements on the packaging of heated tobacco devices. Any requirements should therefore ensure that sufficient space remains for all essential regulatory information.

Pack inserts in packaging for all tobacco and herbal smoking products and heated tobacco devices

Quit themed pack inserts will soon be introduced for cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco following previous consultation. We propose to also include quit themed pack inserts in the packaging of:

- all tobacco products (including products such as such as cigars, cigarillos, pipe tobacco, waterpipe tobacco and smokeless and heated tobacco)
- heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products

We do not propose including pack inserts in cigarette papers due to the small size of the packaging.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce pack inserts for all tobacco products? This does not include cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco which we are addressing separately to this consultation.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce pack inserts for heated tobacco devices?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce pack inserts for herbal smoking products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that pack inserts should not be required in the packaging of cigarette papers? We do not propose including pack inserts for cigarette papers due to the small size of the packaging.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on specific tobacco products for which you do or do not think pack inserts should apply. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that pack inserts should be introduced, where practical, for all tobacco products. They are a cost-effective way to highlight quit themed messages and promote cessation at a time when the product is about to be used. They have been introduced in several other countries, including Canada and Australia, and smoking rates have declined in this period

We agree that pack inserts should be included in heated tobacco devices and herbal smoking products as they are not a safe product and it is important to provide the same motivational quit messages and cessation advice to these users, as with smoking.

We agree that providing pack inserts for cigarette papers is impractical due to size constraints.

In addition pack inserts may support consumer understanding and expectations regarding product risks, providing it is not to the detriment of the product information requirements in the required accompanying documentation for heated tobacco devices, that should include safety use and warnings, CE Markings and traceability information.

Time allowed to implement new packaging requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to update their packaging to comply. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean all products covered by our tobacco packaging proposals would need to comply with any new requirements by the end of a 12-month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree?
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that a time period of no longer than 12 months is necessary from the date legislation is introduced. This will allow manufactures to adapt packaging requirements and sell through existing stock. It is important that no longer than 12 months is permitted as this will undermine the importance of the introduction of the new requirements and the impact this may have on people wanting to quit tobacco products and starting in the first place. With advances in technology, it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced and new packaging produced to meet the requirements.

An additional 6-month grace/transition period may be considered for retailers to allow them to sell through any lawful transitional stock.

Heated tobacco device appearance

Restricting the colour and finish of heated tobacco devices

We propose to restrict the colour of heated tobacco devices to Pantone 448C (drab dark brown) with an opaque matt finish. Pantone 448C is the same colour as cigarette and hand-rolling tobacco packaging.

Restricting the colour of the device in this way would also prevent certain aesthetic features on the device, such as the presence of cosmetic lights.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the colour of heated tobacco devices to Pantone 448C (drab dark brown) with an opaque matt finish?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that heated tobacco devices should be banned from having cosmetic lights? This will not apply to functional lights, like those that indicate charge level.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether restricting heated tobacco devices to an alternative colour may be more effective, or whether technical exemptions are required. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that the packaging of all tobacco products should be restricted to highlight that none of these products have been proven safe to use. Colours and lights should be restricted to prevent marketing and the appeal of the products to young people. There should be strict and clear guidelines to help ensure that manufacturers are clear what is permitted and that the legislation is easily enforceable.

We agree restricting the colour of heated tobacco devices aligns these to all tobacco products and may help raise consumer awareness about the product's risks. For these devices, the required product, safety and traceability information must be included. Therefore, the standardised colour of the device could potentially improve the visibility and consistency of safety markings and risk information, helping consumers recognise key information more easily.

We agree on a ban of cosmetic lights on these devices. Products must be compliant with EU General Product Safety regulations in that they do not imitate food. Legislation should prevent product endorsements that mislead consumers about the risks of using the product. The cosmetic lights features may imitate other consumer goods (games) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermines health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

Restricting branding, imagery and artwork on heated tobacco devices

We propose to ban heated tobacco devices from having images or artwork on them, except for any image that is a regulatory requirement, such as required warnings.

We also propose to limit branding to a single brand name, which would be subject to a set font, size and colour on the device.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict all branding, imagery and artwork on heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on which of the proposed restrictions you do or do not think should apply. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the branding, imagery and artwork should be restricted on heated tobacco devices to prevent marketing and particularly the appeal of the products to young people. This could lead to a health benefit by preventing young people from starting to smoke and assisting those wanting to stop. There should be strict and clear guidelines to help ensure that manufacturers are clear what is permitted and that the legislation is easily enforceable.

This could also simplify the appearance of the device, and subject to device size, may allow required safety warnings for electronic devices, and the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements to be more easily seen. However complicated artwork can be difficult to duplicate and counterfeit, and while this may assist with enforcement, restricted branding may make it more difficult for consumers to distinguish between devices and identify compatible consumables and accessories. A requirement for clear product identification of electrical devices helps to promote safer use.

Restricting digital screens on heated tobacco devices

We propose that digital screens on heated tobacco devices are restricted to only display safety and status information, such as battery levels.

Do you agree or disagree that digital screens on heated tobacco devices should be restricted to only the display of safety and status information such as battery level, and be greyscale in colour (black, white and grey only)?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the digital screens on heated tobacco should be restricted to prevent these being used for marketing purposes. This could help reduce the appeal to both current users and young people, reducing their use and uptake.

Digital displays should be restricted to functional, safety and device status information and should not be used for promotional or branding purposes. Also, subject to the device size, a screen size could compete for space with mandatory product and safety information required on the device. However, for consumer safety, colour displays can provide important benefits by highlighting warnings, maintenance requirements, battery conditions and device faults more clearly than monochrome displays. The use of limited colours for these purposes may improve consumer understanding and support the safe operation of the device.

Stopping heated tobacco devices imitating other products

We propose to limit the potential appeal of heated tobacco devices by stopping them from looking like other products, such as drink bottles and game devices.

This proposal aligns with the restrictions we are proposing for vape devices. It will ensure that heated tobacco devices do not appear more attractive than vapes.

Do you agree or disagree that heated tobacco devices should not be permitted to mimic the design of other products and items? The objective of this proposal is to limit the appeal or attractiveness of heated tobacco devices.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that heated tobacco devices should not mimic the design of other products. Products must be compliant with EU General Product Safety regulations in that they must not imitate food. Legislation should prevent product endorsements that mislead consumers about the risks of using products that imitate other consumer goods (games devices) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermines health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

From a consumer safety perspective, requirements that prevent products from being designed to resemble toys, food, cosmetics or other everyday consumer goods would help reduce confusion about the nature of the product and its associated risks. Such measures may also help prevent accidental handling or misuse, particularly by children and other vulnerable groups.

Time allowed to implement new device requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to ensure their devices are compliant. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean heated tobacco devices would need to comply with any new requirements by the end of a 12-month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that a time period of no longer than 12 months is necessary from the date legislation is introduced. This will allow manufactures to adapt and sell through existing stock. It is important that no longer than 12 months is permitted as this will undermine the importance of the introduction of the new requirements and the impact this may have on people wanting to quit and starting in the first place. With advances in technology it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new packaging produced to meet the requirements.

An additional 6-month grace/transition period may be considered for retailers to allow them to sell through any lawful transitional stock.

Vaping and nicotine product packaging and flavour descriptors

Definition of vaping products

Throughout this section, we refer to 'vaping products'. This includes vapes, as well as other vape components and refill containers sold separately from the device.

Restricting the colour on packaging for all vaping and nicotine products

We propose that the packaging for vaping and nicotine products should be white.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the colour of packaging of all vaping products to white?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the colour of packaging of all nicotine products to white?

- Agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the packaging for vapes and nicotine products should be plain and simple to reduce attractiveness of the products, particularly to image conscious young people. Keeping this white will ensure that manufacturers are clear on the requirement and will ensure that the legislation is easily enforceable.

Colour restrictions can help reduce the risk of packaging resembling sweets, confectionery or other consumer goods, while safety information and health warnings may be displayed more prominently. However, packaging of vape components (contains e-liquid), requires safety warnings and symbols under the Classification of Labelling and Packaging legislation must be considered to ensure warning symbols remain visible and compliant – i.e. in circumstances where warnings are specifically required to appear on a white or yellow background. Therefore, the standardised colour could potentially improve the visibility and consistency of safety markings and risk information, helping consumers recognise key information more easily.

Restricting imagery, branding, text and other promotional features

We propose that the packaging for all vaping and nicotine products should not include imagery, and that all text on the packaging, including any branding or brand names, should be in a standard colour, font and typeface.

There should be no other promotional features on the outside or inside of packs or attached to the packaging, such as links to social media accounts or any feature that suggests a financial benefit, such as vouchers or discounts.

We recognise that there may be a case to allow packaging of vaping products to display a picture of the product contained inside (for example, a mouthpiece). We welcome views on whether any limited exemptions may be appropriate in the free text box.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the restrictions to imagery, branding, text and promotional features outlined above for the packaging of all vaping products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the restrictions to imagery, branding, text and promotional features outlined above for the packaging of all nicotine products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, your views on whether there should be any exemptions or further restrictions. You may also indicate any elements of the proposal you disagree with and why, or elements you feel could be further strengthened. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that packaging for vape and nicotine products should be free of all imagery and standard in size and colour. In addition, no marketing or promotion should be permitted. This will assist in reducing the appeal and attractiveness of the products, particularly to young people and assist those wanting to quit.

If any exemptions are permitted to allow pictures of the products on vape packaging the wording of the legislation should be clear to ensure that manufacturers are aware what is permitted and that this is easily enforceable.

We agree in principle on the restrictions for vape and nicotine products packaging, providing this is not to the detriment of safety warnings for nicotine (as designated under the Classification, Labelling and Packaging legislation), electronic devices which are subject to CE Marking or traceability requirements as required under Market Surveillance Regulations (NI) 2021.

Harmonised packaging standards across the market should require clear and prominent product identification, safety information and user instructions. Also, include information such as nicotine strength, product compatibility, battery specifications and relevant safety warnings so that consumers can make informed purchasing and usage decisions. Simplifying the packaging should allow this safety information and warnings to be more visible. However, it is noted complicated artwork can be difficult to duplicate and counterfeit.

Restricting the shape, materials and safety features of packaging for all vaping and nicotine products

We propose that packaging used for vaping and nicotine products should use uniform shapes. For example, the packaging for devices or coils should use a similar shape, such as a rectangular cuboid, depending on their dimensions.

We also propose that manufacturers should not use materials that enhance a product's appeal, such as:

- glossy plastics
- holographic foils
- other tactile features, for example fuzzy or velvety materials

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all vaping products should have uniform shapes, and that there should be restrictions on materials and finishes that can enhance appeal?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all nicotine products should have uniform shapes, and that there should be restrictions on materials and finishes that can enhance appeal?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Vapes are already required to have child-resistant and tamper-evident packaging. We propose to introduce this requirement for all vaping and nicotine products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all vaping products should be both child-resistant and tamper-evident?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all nicotine products should be both child-resistant and tamper-evident?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, indicating any elements of the proposal that you disagree with and why, if there are elements that you feel could be further strengthened or other features that should be included. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree with any proposals such as restricting the shape, finish etc of any nicotine or vape product that will help reduce their attractiveness and appeal, particularly to young people.

This could also provide a consistent approach that minimises consumer confusion and avoids potential misuse.

In addition, both nicotine and vape products should have child-resistant and tamper-evident packaging. This will help ensure the safety of the product and make counterfeit products more difficult to produce and more recognisable.

This would also support consumer protection, create clear user expectations and help ensure a consistent level of product safety across the market. A uniform approach may also reduce the likelihood of products being designed to resemble other consumer goods, helping to minimise consumer confusion and potential misuse. However, regulations should ensure that safety markings, warnings and user information remain clear and prominent so that consumers receive consistent risk information. Packaging should also include appropriate traceability information, such as serial numbers, batch numbers and manufacturer details, to support compliance checks and reduce the need for enforcement officers to open packages which can increase inspection times and result in unnecessary product wastage.

Restricting flavour descriptions on vaping and nicotine products packaging

Single lead flavour

We propose to restrict flavour descriptors on the packaging for vaping and nicotine products to a single, recognised flavour name, like apple or strawberry. This would include restricting hyphenated or combined flavour names, such as blueberry-apple.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict flavour descriptors on the packaging of all vaping products to a single lead flavour?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict flavour descriptors on the packaging of all nicotine products to a single lead flavour?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Concept, sensory, food and drink categories

We also propose restricting any concept or sensory words from being used to describe a flavour.

A concept name refers to any flavour name that does not directly describe a recognisable food, drink or natural flavour. Instead, the word conveys a mood, an idea, a brand or even

a number or codename, rather than describing an actual flavour. This could include flavour names such as:

- 'Unicorn Dream'
- 'DC100'

A sensory name refers to a recognisable taste, smell or sensation experienced when using a vape or nicotine product, such as 'Mint Blast'.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that concept and sensory flavour descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all vaping products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that concept and sensory flavour descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all nicotine products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

We also propose restricting descriptor names of certain food and drink categories that appeal to children and young people. This includes flavours like:

- confectionery and sweets (such as 'Chocolate', 'Candy' and 'Bubblegum')
- desserts and cakes (such as 'Brownie' and 'Cheesecake')
- alcohol and other drinks (such as 'Cola')

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that confectionery, sweets, dessert and cake name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all vaping products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that confectionery, sweets, dessert and cake name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all nicotine products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that alcohol and drink name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all vaping products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that alcohol and drink name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all nicotine products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, your views on any elements of the proposal that you disagree with and why, or any flavour names that you believe should or should not be restricted. You may also wish to comment on whether there should be any differences in how these restrictions apply to vaping and nicotine products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We strongly support any measures that would reduce the appeal of vape and nicotine products to young people. Restricting both the name and the packaging to prevent descriptors that are aimed to entice people to buy will reduce uptake and assist those wanting to quit. A single lead flavour should be permitted to describe the flavour, and alcohol descriptors should be prohibited.

The wording of the legislation around this would need to be carefully considered to ensure that it is clear and prevents loopholes for manufacturers to use words or descriptors that could be used in marketing to appeal to young people. Clear guidance should be provided for both manufacturers and enforcement officers around this.

To avoid misleading the consumer the terminology needs to be clearly defined and there needs to be clear and consistent standards that can be understood by both the consumer and enforcement officers. While we appreciate this intention enforcement of such restrictions will be difficult without a clear mechanism for testing or analysis to compare flavours with those described. It is difficult to see how enforcement of this could be undertaken and by whom.

Product information on and inside vaping and nicotine products packaging

We propose that the packaging of all vaping and nicotine products should have:

- a full list of ingredients, including flavour agents
- expiration details
- an age restriction symbol, for example a crossed-out 18 symbol
- a standardised display of nicotine strength, for example in milligrams, millilitres or as a percentage
- nicotine delivery per puff or pouch, where relevant

We also propose that relevant products should have a nicotine warning label on the front and back of the packaging. For example, this warning could say 'This product contains nicotine which is a highly addictive substance'. Packaging should also have clear instructions on appropriate waste disposal.

Where applicable, we propose that certain products have an instruction leaflet to inform users of any appropriate warnings and the adverse effects of nicotine.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to require the consumer information listed above on and inside the packaging of all vaping products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to require the consumer information listed above on and inside the packaging of all nicotine products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on any elements of the proposal that you disagree with and why, if there are areas that you feel could be further strengthened or areas that have been missed and should be included. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree consumer information provided on and inside the packaging of vaping and nicotine products strengthens the current approach and supports consumer protection by helping consumers make informed purchasing decisions, understand product hazards, follow safe usage instructions and avoid misuse. Information requirements on and inside packaging should be clearly defined and applied consistently across the market. Also, clear traceability information should remain prominent on packaging. Challenges arise where enforcement officers are required to open packaging or break seals to verify product information. This can result in additional burdens for retailers through damaged stock,

increased handling requirements and potential product wastage, while also extending inspection times for enforcement officers.

Time allowed to implement new packaging requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to update their packaging to be compliant. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with the new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean all products in scope of our vaping and nicotine product packaging proposals would need to comply with any new regulatory requirements by the end of a 12 month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that a time period of no longer than 12 months is necessary from the date legislation is introduced. This will allow manufactures to adapt packaging requirements and sell through existing stock. It is important that no longer than 12 months is permitted as this will undermine the importance of the introduction of the new requirements and the impact this may have on people wanting to quit tobacco products and starting in the first place. With advances in technology, it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new packaging produced to meet the requirements.

An additional 6-month grace/transition period may be considered for retailers to allow them to sell through lawful transitional stock.

Clear guidance, commencement dates and evidence requirements for enforcement officers is essential to distinguish lawful transitional stock from non-compliant products. Appropriate

resources are needed for enforcement officers to manage the transition and dedicated to give notice to business and consumers, then 12 months allows enforcement authorities time to prepare guidance, training and a compliance workplan.

Vape device appearance

Restricting the colour and finish of vapes

We propose restricting the colour of vape devices, including all visible parts, to:

- white, black or grey, with only one of those colours per device
- a matt finish
- no variation in shades or opacity

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to limit the colour of a vaping device (including all visible parts) to white, black or grey with a matt finish?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that vape devices should be banned from having cosmetic lights? This would not apply to functional lights, such as those that indicate charge level.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether you think no restrictions should apply, if you think only a subset of the proposed colours should be allowed or if you think alternative colours should be allowed. Equally, you may want to highlight technical exemptions that should be considered. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that vaping devices should be restricted to plain and simple colours with a matt finish. There is no functional need for devices to have brightly coloured designs and cosmetic lights. Restricting the appearance of these devices will help reduce the appeal to young people, reducing the number of young people starting to vape and assisting those wanting to quit.

Standardised colour and finish of vapes helps move the consumer's focus from aesthetics appeal and encourage purchasing decisions based on product information. Permitting only a subset of colours will reduce the likelihood of appearance undermining the health and safety information, by improving the visibility of regulatory markings and warnings.

Colour restrictions on these devices also reduce the risk of packaging resembling sweets, confectionery or other consumer goods, while safety information and health warnings may be displayed more prominently. Therefore, standardised colour of the device could potentially improve the visibility and consistency of safety markings and risk information, helping consumers recognise key information more easily.

We agree on a ban of cosmetic lights on these devices as the feature may imitate other consumer goods (games) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermines health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

Restricting branding, imagery, and artwork on vapes

We propose that vapes are banned from having images or artwork, except for where these may be a legal requirement, such as warnings.

We also propose that branding should be limited to a single brand name, which would be subject to a set font, size and colour on the device. This aligns with the restrictions we are proposing for heated tobacco devices.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict all branding, imagery and artwork on vapes?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether you think none or only some of the proposed restrictions should apply. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that there should be no branding, imagery and artwork on vapes. This has been used by manufactures to make vapes seem attractive and cool to young people. Restricting this use of marketing will help reduce the appeal to both current users and young people, reducing their use and uptake.

From a consumer safety perspective a simplified device appearance, subject to the device size, may increase visibility of required safety warnings for electronic devices, and the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements. However complicated artwork can be difficult to duplicate and counterfeit. Also, restricted branding may make it more difficult for consumers to distinguish between devices and identify compatible consumables and accessories. A standardised requirement for clear product identification of electrical devices helps to promote safer use.

Restricting the digital screens on vapes

We propose that digital screens on vapes are prohibited, except for screens which display safety and status information such as battery and liquid levels.

Do you agree or disagree that digital screens on vapes should be restricted to only the display of safety and status information such as battery level, and be greyscale in colour (black, white and grey only)? This would not include lights that indicate status information, such as when the device is being recharged.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

Digital displays should be restricted to functional, safety and device status information and should not be used for promotional or branding purposes. Also, subject to the device size, a screen size could compete for space with mandatory product and safety information required on the device. However, for consumer safety, colour displays can provide important benefits by highlighting warnings, maintenance requirements, battery conditions and device faults more clearly than monochrome displays. The use of limited colours for these purposes may improve consumer understanding and support the safe operation of the device.

Stopping vapes imitating other products

Currently vapes can and do copy the design of other products, such as highlighter pens, refillable water bottles and game devices.

We propose to limit the potential appeal of vapes by stopping them from looking like other products.

Do you agree or disagree that vapes should not be permitted to mimic the design of other products and items? The objective of this proposal is to limit the appeal or attractiveness of vapes.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree prohibiting vapes from imitating other products aligns with the proposed restrictions for heated tobacco devices and helps ensure a consistent regulatory approach across the market.

Food imitation legislation currently exists under EU General Product Safety Regulation 2023/988. However, work needs to be carried out to ensure this can be applied to vapes and vaping products. Legislation should prevent product endorsements that mislead consumers about the risks of using products that imitate other consumer goods (games devices) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermines health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

From a consumer safety perspective, requirements that prevent products from being designed to resemble toys, food, cosmetics or other everyday consumer goods would help reduce confusion about the nature of the product and its associated risks. Such measures may also help prevent accidental handling or misuse, particularly by children and other vulnerable groups.

Time allowed to implement new device requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to ensure their devices are compliant. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean all vapes would need to comply with any new regulatory requirements by the end of a 12 month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that a time period of no longer than 12 months is necessary from the date legislation is introduced. This will allow manufactures to adapt packaging requirements and sell through existing stock. It is important that no longer than 12 months is permitted as this

will undermine the importance of the introduction of the new requirements and the impact this may have on people wanting to quit tobacco products and starting in the first place. With advances in technology, it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new packaging produced to meet the requirements.

An additional 6-month grace/transition period may be considered for retailers to allow them to sell through lawful transitional stock.

Clear guidance, commencement dates and evidence requirements for enforcement officers is essential to distinguish lawful transitional stock from non-compliant products. Appropriate resources are required for enforcement officers to manage the transition and dedicated to give notice to business and consumers, then 12 months allows enforcement authorities time to prepare guidance, training and a compliance workplan.

Retail display

Requested temporary and incidental displays in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Under existing legislation, tobacco products cannot be displayed inside or outside most shops across the UK. However, tobacco products can be shown to a customer following a request. The request must be by a person who is of the legal age of sale in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. We call this a 'requested temporary display' in this consultation.

Requested temporary displays enable informed purchasing decisions. As a result of a requested temporary display, other people nearby may also incidentally see these products. Current legislation in England, Wales and Northern Ireland also makes allowances for:

- restocking
- staff training
- pricing
- display unit maintenance

We call this 'incidental display' in this consultation.

Restricting the retail display of cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products in England, Wales and Northern Ireland **Tobacco products**

We propose that the requested temporary display of all tobacco products should only be allowed from behind a sales counter, and not another location within a retail setting.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce a legal requirement that the requested temporary display of all tobacco products must take place from behind a sales counter?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Don't know

Cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products

We propose that most of the restrictions and allowances that apply to the display of tobacco products should apply to cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products too.

This includes:

- restricting the display of these products outside of all retail settings and inside the majority of retail settings
- providing allowances enabling display unit restocking, maintenance, pricing, staff training and requested temporary displays
- permitting the same maximum visible areas (1.5 square meters)

We also propose that the requested temporary display of these products should only be allowed from behind a sales counter, and not another location within a retail setting in the same way as we are proposing to make this a legal requirement for tobacco products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of cigarette papers? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of heated and other tobacco-related devices? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of herbal smoking products? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that it should be a legal requirement that all requested temporary displays of tobacco products are made behind a sales counter. This will help ensure that the display of the products is managed and restricted to the person requesting this. It will also ensure that the rules around temporary display are clear and will assist with consistent enforcement. This may also help prevent retailers from trying to circumvent the restriction by displaying the products in another area when requested and trying to promote to other customers.

We believe that all tobacco products and accessories should be subject to the restricted display requirements. Cigarette papers are widely sold, including in shops not selling cigarettes or tobacco, e.g. large chain discount retailers and by not being visible this reduces their appeal and accessibility. As with all tobacco products this will help reduce impulse purchases, assisting those wanting to quit smoking and preventing young people from starting.

We believe that herbal smoking products, heated and other tobacco-related devices should be subject to display restrictions and only sold from behind a counter. By introducing the same restrictions for all tobacco products this highlights and reinforces the message to the consumer that the product is not safe. This will also help ensure that smoking these does not become normalised in society and act as a gateway to smoking cigarettes.

It is vital that all such products are restricted in the same way to prevent impulse purchases and their accessibility and appeal to young people.

Retail display of prices for cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Retailers can display prices for tobacco products in 3 formats:

- a single price list that can be permanently on display at each point of sale, but must be text-only and subject to size and font requirements
- a picture price list that can include product images and can only be shown in response to a request by a person who is of the legal age of sale
- small price labels that can be placed on the covered shelf or on the display unit where the product is kept, pending sale

We propose to apply the same price display principles to:

- cigarette papers
- all tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for cigarette papers?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for all tobacco-related devices including heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for herbal smoking products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the display of price lists for cigarette papers should be restricted in line with the current requirements for tobacco products. We also agree that the display of price lists for herbal smoking products and tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices should be restricted and in line with the current requirements for tobacco products.

It is vital that size limits are not increased as price lists could easily become an alternative form of in store promotion.

In addition, we believe that there should be a restriction placed on retailers to ensure that price lists only show the current price and do not draw attention to price promotions or reductions.

Exemptions to display restrictions for tobacco products, cigarette papers, tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Across the UK, there are exemptions that allow for tobacco products and their prices to be on display inside certain premises. These premises include:

- relevant trade premises (those that are only accessible to people that work in the tobacco trade)
- specialist tobacconists
- bulk tobacconists (including duty-free tobacco areas)

In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, we propose to maintain current exemptions for tobacco products for relevant trade premises and specialist tobacconists.

If and when additional retail display restrictions are brought in, we also propose that relevant trade premises and specialist tobacconists will continue to be allowed to display the following products, and their prices:

- cigarette papers
- heated and other tobacco-related devices
- herbal smoking products

We propose to remove the bulk tobacconist exemption for tobacco products and to not replicate it for any other products in scope of this consultation, since it presents a situation where products may be visibly accessible to the public, including children and young people.

Display exemptions for trade premises

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of cigarette papers and their prices in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices, and their prices in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of herbal smoking products and their prices in relevant trade premises?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, why you think certain exemptions should or should not be considered as well as any additional exemptions you think are necessary. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that for the purpose of those working in the trade it is reasonable that cigarette papers, herbal smoking products and tobacco related devices, including heated tobacco devices and their prices are displayed in relevant trade premises, provided access is restricted to those over 18 years of age.

Display exemptions for specialist tobacconists

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of cigarette papers and their prices inside specialist tobacconists?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices, and their prices inside specialist tobacconists?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of herbal smoking products and their prices inside specialist tobacconists?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think proposed exemptions should or should not be considered as well as any

additional exemptions you think are necessary. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the display of cigarette papers, tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco, herbal smoking products, and their prices can be displayed within specialist tobacconists, provided access is restricted to those over 18 years of age. They should not be able to have any advertisement visible from the outside of their premises. We believe that this should include price display lists as these could be used as a form of advertisement or to highlight promotions and be visible to children.

Display exemptions for bulk tobacconists

We propose to remove the bulk tobacconist exemption for tobacco products and their prices and to not replicate it for any other products in scope of this consultation. Keeping the exemption would mean children and young people may still be able to see these products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to remove and not replicate this exemption for all products in scope of this consultation?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. Where possible please include any information on any costs to bulk tobacconists associated with removing this exemption for tobacco products, including the number of businesses likely to be affected. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that bulk tobacconists should be subject to the same restrictions as other consumer retail premises. We feel that it is important that these establishments do not become loopholes that will undermine the spirit of the regulations and believe that the regulations should be extended to include a restriction on persons under the age of 18 being able to gain access to these areas. These areas should be subjected to age restriction and verification of age upon entrance.

Definition of vaping products

Throughout this section, we refer to 'vaping products'. This includes vapes, as well as other vape components and refill containers sold separately from the device.

Restricting the display of vaping and nicotine products across the UK

We propose that the display of vaping products and nicotine products is restricted.

We propose that the same allowances for temporary and incidental displays as we have proposed for most other products within scope of this consultation are applied across the UK. This includes a temporary requested display taking place behind a sales counter. This

would make the maximum visible area permitted for a requested temporary display or incidental display:

- 1.5 square metres in England, Wales and Northern Ireland
- 0.1 square metres in Scotland

We also propose that a requested temporary or incidental display of vaping or nicotine products must not result in the display of:

- tobacco products (and smoking-related products in Scotland)
- cigarette papers
- heated and other tobacco-related devices
- herbal smoking products

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of vaping products? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of nicotine products? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that the requested temporary or incidental display of vaping and nicotine products should not result in the display of tobacco products (and smoking-related products in Scotland), cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco devices or herbal smoking products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products.

(Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that any display of vaping and nicotine products should not result in the display of any other product. Each product should be stored independently to ensure no deliberate or inadvertent display takes place during a request for one type of product.

We support the removal of the display of nicotine and vaping products as we believe this will reduce the attractiveness and availability to children and support those wanting to quit vaping. In addition, ensuring that this display can only be made from behind a sales counter will limit the ability to get around the display restriction by ensuring this is in one area and not used to promote vape.

Display of prices of vaping and nicotine products across the UK

Across the UK, we propose to apply the same principles for the display of prices of tobacco products to:

- vaping products
- nicotine products

We propose that the price lists for vaping and nicotine products are permitted to also include nicotine strength and ingredients. This will help consumers make informed purchases.

We propose that separate price lists must be used for vaping and nicotine products and for tobacco products, for both permanently displayed price lists and picture prices lists, given vaping and nicotine products carry lower levels of harm than tobacco products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for vaping products, and allow for additional information on nicotine strength and ingredients?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for nicotine products and allow for additional information on nicotine strength and ingredients?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products.

(Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that price lists for vaping and nicotine products should be aligned with tobacco products and additional information on ingredients and strength permitted.

Exemptions to display restrictions of vaping and nicotine products across the UK

Across the UK, it is permitted to display tobacco products inside premises that are only accessible to people working in the tobacco trade as long as this is not visible to the public from the outside. We propose to have this exemption to allow for relevant trade premises to display vaping products and nicotine products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of vaping products in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of nicotine products in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. If you have comments on business exemptions to our display proposals, please include them here. This could include, for example, why you think certain exemptions should or should not be considered as well as any additional exemptions you think are necessary. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that for trade only premises the display of vaping and nicotine products should be permitted.

Time allowed to implement all new display restrictions

If and when new requirements are introduced, retailers will need time to update their shops to comply with the necessary changes.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 6 months would be enough. This would mean the display of products in scope would need to comply with any new requirements by the end of a 6-month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree with our proposal that there should be a minimum of 6 months' notice (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have taken into account to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that 6 months is a reasonable time for retailers to implement the necessary changes to ensure the display restrictions are met. The introduction of the display ban for tobacco products highlighted that this could be achieved in a simple and cost-effective way.

We do not feel that any longer than 6 months is required. This balances the need for action, to remove promotional displays which may encourage young people from starting to use the relevant products and supporting those who wish to give up, with the time required for district councils to prepare for advisory and enforcement activities and for retailers to comply.

Consultation stage impact assessments

We have published consultation stage impact assessments alongside this consultation. The Scottish government, Welsh government and the Department of Health in Northern Ireland have also published impact assessments for proposals relating to retail display.

We would like to hear about any measurable impacts we have not considered in these initial impact assessments.

The data and evidence used in the impact assessments reflects the best available at the time of their completion in October 2025 (May 2026 for the impact assessment for Scotland and June 2026 for the impact assessments for Wales and Northern Ireland). Following this consultation, we will update the impact assessments as appropriate, including in consideration of information we gather through responses and any new data and evidence made available since their publication.

For each impact assessment, you will be asked the following questions. You can respond to as many questions and impact assessments as you want to.

For the retail display impact assessment, you can also respond about the impact assessments for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Please make it clear which one you're responding to.

If you have any evidence or data to inform the assumptions or estimates in the consultation stage impact assessment, please enter it in the relevant free text box.

Please do not include any personal information in your response.

Provide any evidence to inform our estimates in the impact assessment of the benefits of the proposed policy. For example, information on the impact that options will have on the number of people using products in scope and/or health benefits associated with any reduction in usage. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Provide any evidence to inform our estimates in the impact assessment of the costs of the proposed policy. For example, information on profit margins for manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers, and/or costs and process of product redesign. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Specify any stakeholders that may be impacted by the proposed policy and/or costs and benefits that we have not identified in the impact assessment. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Outline any potential unintended consequences of the proposed policy that we have not identified in the impact assessment. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Provide any other comments to inform our assumptions or analysis in the impact assessment. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

File upload

If you would like to upload a document to support your submission, you will be able to do so. Please do not upload information that could identify you or another member of the public.