

DRAFT

25.4.86

PROJECT EMN

Presentation by C. Warren and P. Dunn

Millbank 22nd April, 1986

The presentation given was not quite as Cliff will give to the IMASCO board, since questions were taken as it went along. Thus, rather than the 1-1½ hours intended, it went on for nearer 2 hours and thus lost some of its connecting threads.

The part given by Cliff is designed specifically to be in "laymans" terms, and tries to address a concern that the tobacco industry is not being as responsible to its customers and society as is, for instance, the food industry. It centres on the views and opinions of outside sources in relation to the constituents of smoke and their deliveries to the smoker, and how, in the long term, the industry should understand and seek to modify its product in order to produce the "safer" cigarette.

The part given by Pat was more specific and addressed the evidence of the effects of product design on activity. While admitting that some of this evidence was dated, it was possible to adduce certain ways forward where a more modern approach and suitable test systems could be brought to bear.

For example:

- (a) To address more directly the problem of 'thresholds' and position in the dose response curves of toxic components in tobacco smoke. The modification of these interactions as a result of the complexity of the multicomponents of cigarette smoke would also be probed.
- (b) To investigate the interaction of genetic pre-disposition, toxicity of lifestyles and tobacco smoking.
- (c) The use of up-to-date technologies e.g. Plant breeding and bio-technology at all levels of product preparation, to design low activity products as defined in the bioassay system currently available. The 'nettle' of possible addition to tobacco of toxic, neutralising or protective agents for delivery to the customer would also be tackled.

Contd/...

100505039

Contd/...

This is undoubtedly a major undertaking, especially in the area of recruitment and co-ordination of outside technical assistance, but almost equally in the internal resource allocation of BAT Group companies. Of the four areas propounded (p. 18 of green booklet) it could be argued that BAT cannot, and possibly should not, try to attack all simultaneously. Indeed, smoke chemistry and bioassays are part of the current Research Programme, though not in the depth propounded by EMN. It could be argued that it is more sensible to concentrate BAT's efforts into these areas, albeit with increased effort and resources, at the expense of using only outside resources for epidemiology and mechanism studies.

To do so would, however, tend to mean that BAT had no internal effort in these areas and, it could be argued, this would tend to lower the impact of EMN as a strategy which BAT, as an entity, or IMASCO, as an offshoot was following.

In terms of future progress, rough estimates on time scales were available, in the region of 10-20 years, whilst manpower requirements were not yet under consideration. The present proposals are to obtain BAT's commitment as a whole. The planning phase to consider detailed proposals and effort allocation would be the next and most profound step of the project.

In our opinion, EMN is a worthwhile overall objective which, if even it were unable to sell more products, might assist in lengthening the product life-cycle and maintain company integrity within the legal framework of product liability. For the latter reason it deserves support, even if this support must necessarily be qualified in some areas.

100505090