



Global Health Diplomacy Program

2007 Port of Spain Summit Compliance: Tobacco Warning Labels

Alissa Wang, October 22, 2015

This report assesses compliance with the commitment below from the 2007 Port of Spain Declaration based on actions taken by the Caribbean countries between 15 September 2007 and 15 September 2008.

Commitment

2007-7: [we] insist on effective warning labels [for tobacco]

Compliance

Member	No compliance	Partial compliance	Full compliance
Anguilla	No references		
Antigua and Barbuda	-1		
Bahamas		0	
Barbados	-1		
Belize	-1		
Bermuda	No references		
British Virgin Islands	No references		
Cayman Islands	No references		
Dominica	-1		
Grenada	-1		
Guyana		0	
Haiti	No references		
Jamaica			+1
Montserrat	No references		
Saint Kitts and Nevis	-1		
Saint Lucia	-1		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	-1		
Suriname	-1		
Trinidad and Tobago		0	
Turks and Caicos	No references		
Average	-0.62		

Background

On 15 September 2007, the heads of government of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) attended a summit at Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, focusing on the theme of “Uniting to stop the epidemic of chronic NCDs.” Recognizing that the Caribbean region is one of the worst affected regions by non-communicable diseases (NCDs) in the Americas, the leaders took on the challenge of preventing and controlling the NCDs of heart disease, stroke, diabetes, hypertension, obesity and cancer by addressing the causal risk factors: lack of physical activity, tobacco use, alcohol abuse and unhealthy diets.¹ Commitments from 2007-02 to 2007-08 cover tobacco use.

Heads of government gave full support to pursuing a legislative agenda in line with the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC).² The FCTC is the world’s first global health treaty developed in response to the globalized tobacco epidemic. The convention consists of 38 articles divided into the following sections: objectives and guiding principles; demand side reduction measures; supply side reduction measures; protection of the environment; liability; cooperation and communication; institutional arrangements and financial resources; settlement of disputes; development of the convention; and statutory measures.³

Part III of the FCTC focuses on measures relating to reducing demand for tobacco. Commitment 2007-07 responds specifically to article 11 under Part III, which requires parties to “adopt and implement effective measures to prohibit misleading tobacco packaging and labelling; ensure that tobacco product packages carry large health warnings and messages describing the harmful effects of tobacco use; ensure that such warnings cover 50% or more, but not less than 30%, of principal display areas and that they are in the Parties’ principal language(s); and ensure that packages contain prescribed information on the tobacco products’ constituents and emissions.”⁴

Commitment Features:

This commitment comprises three primary aspects to be measured for compliance:

1. To “insist” takes the form of legislative action. Law that mandates specific warnings counts as compliance in this aspect. This is monitored by the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), which reports on whether or not there are laws mandating specific warning.
2. The content of warning labels is the second aspect of compliance. Warning labels should contain, as stated by the FCTC text, “harmful effects of tobacco use” and “prescribed information on the tobacco products’ constituents and emissions.”

The FCTC implementation database monitors most CARICOM members’ implementation of this aspect of the commitment under the section for article 11, “Packaging and labelling of tobacco products.” Relevant questions include whether the country requires that “packaging and labelling also carry health warnings describing the harmful effects of tobacco use” and whether it requires that

¹ COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE REGIONAL SUMMIT OF HEADS OF GOVERNMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY (CARICOM) ON CHRONIC NON-COMMUNICABLE DISEASES (NCDs), 15 September 2007, Caribbean Community Secretariat. Date accessed: 6 August 2015.

http://www.caricom.org/jsp/communications/communiques/chronic_non_communicable_diseases.jsp

² COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE REGIONAL SUMMIT OF HEADS OF GOVERNMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY (CARICOM) ON CHRONIC NON-COMMUNICABLE DISEASES (NCDs), 15 September 2007, Caribbean Community Secretariat. Date accessed: 6 August 2015.

http://www.caricom.org/jsp/communications/communiques/chronic_non_communicable_diseases.jsp

³ The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: an overview, WHO.

http://www.who.int/fctc/WHO_FCTC_summary_January2015.pdf?ua=1

⁴ WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, WHO

http://www.who.int/fctc/about/WHO_FCTC_summary_January2015.pdf?ua=1

“packaging and labelling contain information on relevant constituents and emissions of tobacco products.”

PAHO also monitors compliance through tracking whether there is a ban on misleading descriptors and whether warnings describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.

Warning labels that fulfil at least two aspects of qualification as monitored by WHO and PAHO (including harmful health effects, emissions and bans on misleading descriptors) count as full compliance with the content aspect of warning labels. Warning labels that fulfil one such aspect count as partial compliance. Warning labels that do not fulfil any of these aspects count as lack of compliance.

3. “Effectiveness” of warning labels is the third aspect of compliance. This is defined by the FCTC text. An effective warning label can be defined as one that covers 50% or more, but no less than 30% of principal display areas, and is in the country’s principal language(s).

PAHO reports on this aspect of compliance by monitoring whether warning labels exist on each unit package, and by monitoring the size of the warning label as a percentage of principal display area. PAHO also reports on whether warning labels are in the appropriate language. The existence of warnings on each unit packet or outside packaging, combined with the warnings in the appropriate language and covering more than 30% of principal display area qualify as full compliance in the effectiveness aspect. The achievement of at least one of these qualifications counts toward partial compliance, and the lack of all three qualifications counts as lack of compliance.

Scoring Rubric

-1	Lack of compliance in all three aspects of the commitment: no legislative action, lack of relevant content on warning labels, and lack of effectiveness in warning labels, as defined in the commitment features and monitored by the FCTC implementation database and PAHO.
0	A mixture of compliance in the three aspects of the commitment including legislative action, content on warning labels and effectiveness of warning labels, as defined in the commitment features and monitored by the FCTC implementation database and PAHO.
+1	Full compliance in all three aspects of the commitment including legislative action, relevant content on warning labels and fully effective warning labels, as defined in the commitment features and monitored by the FCTC implementation database and PAHO.

Anguilla

No references.

Antigua and Barbuda: -1

Antigua and Barbuda did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

According to the Antigua and Barbuda Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.⁵ Thus, Antigua and Barbuda did not comply with the legislative aspect of tobacco warning labels.

On 29 August 2008, Antigua and Barbuda submitted an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database.⁶ Under the section on article 11, Antigua and Barbuda reported no to

⁵ PAHO, Antigua and Barbuda Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/AntiguaandBarbuda_CR.pdf

“packaging and labelling [that] also carry health warnings describing the harmful effects of tobacco use” and to “packaging and labelling [that] contain information on relevant constituents and emissions of tobacco products.”⁷ As of 2008 there have been no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.⁸ Thus, Antigua and Barbuda did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Antigua and Barbuda Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008, warnings do not appear on each package and outside packaging, health warnings covered 0% of principal display areas, and warnings are not written in the principal language(s) of the country.⁹ Thus, Antigua and Barbuda did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Antigua and Barbuda was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Bahamas: 0

The Bahamas partially complied with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

The Bahamas did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.¹⁰

According to the Bahamas Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were laws mandating specific warnings.¹¹ Thus, Bahamas complied with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Bahamas Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, but warnings describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.¹² Thus, the Bahamas partially complied with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Bahamas Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008, health warnings appeared on each package and outside packaging, warnings are written in the country’s principal language, but covered 0% of principal display areas.¹³ Thus, the Bahamas partially complied with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

The Bahamas was assigned a score of 0 for partial compliance.

Barbados: -1

Barbados did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

⁶ WHO FCTC, Antigua and Barbuda Implementation Report, 3 September 2008. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/antigua_barbuda_report.pdf

⁷ WHO FCTC, Antigua and Barbuda Implementation Report, 3 September 2008. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/antigua_barbuda_report.pdf

⁸ PAHO, Antigua and Barbuda Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/AntiguaandBarbuda_CR.pdf

⁹ PAHO, Antigua and Barbuda Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/AntiguaandBarbuda_CR.pdf

¹⁰ WHO FCTC, Bahamas. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Bahamas>

¹¹ PAHO, Bahamas Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Bahamas_CR.pdf

¹² PAHO, Bahamas Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Bahamas_CR.pdf

¹³ PAHO, Bahamas Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Bahamas_CR.pdf

According to the Barbados Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.¹⁴ Thus, Barbados did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

On 15 July 2008, Barbados submitted an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database.¹⁵ Under the section on article 11 on tobacco product packaging and labelling, Barbados did not provide any reported information.¹⁶

According to the Barbados Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.¹⁷ Thus, Barbados did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Barbados Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover 0% of principal display area.¹⁸ Thus, the Barbados did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Barbados was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Belize: -1

Belize did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

On 7 April 2008, Belize submitted an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database. Under the section on article 11 on tobacco product packaging and labelling, Belize did not provide any reported information.¹⁹

According to the Belize Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.²⁰ Thus, Belize did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Belize Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.²¹ Thus, Belize did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Belize Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover

¹⁴ PAHO, Barbados Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/Barbados_CR.pdf

¹⁵ WHO FCTC, Barbados Implementation Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/barbados_report.pdf

¹⁶ WHO FCTC, Barbados Implementation Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/barbados_report.pdf

¹⁷ PAHO, Barbados Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/Barbados_CR.pdf

¹⁸ PAHO, Barbados Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/Barbados_CR.pdf

¹⁹ WHO FCTC, Belize Implementation Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/belize_report.pdf

²⁰ PAHO, Belize Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Belize_CR.pdf

²¹ PAHO, Belize Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Belize_CR.pdf

0% of principal display area.²² Thus, Belize did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Belize was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Bermuda

No references.

British Virgin Islands

No references.

Cayman Islands: 0

No references.

Dominica: -1

Dominica did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

Dominica did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.²³

According to the Dominica Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.²⁴ Thus, Dominica did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Dominica Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.²⁵ Thus, Dominica did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Dominica Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover 0% of principal display area.²⁶ Thus, Dominica did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Dominica was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Grenada: -1

Grenada did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

Grenada did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.²⁷

According to the Grenada Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.²⁸ Thus, Grenada did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

²² PAHO, Belize Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Belize_CR.pdf

²³ WHO FCTC, Dominica. Date accessed: 1 July 2015..
<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Dominica>

²⁴ PAHO, Dominica Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Dominica_CR.pdf

²⁵ PAHO, Dominica Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Dominica_CR.pdf

²⁶ PAHO, Dominica Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Dominica_CR.pdf

²⁷ WHO FCTC, Grenada. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.
<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Grenada>

According to the Grenada Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.²⁹ Thus, Grenada did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Grenada Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover 0% of principal display area.³⁰ Thus, Grenada did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Grenada was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Guyana: 0

Guyana partially complied with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

On 12 December 2007, Guyana submitted an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database. Under the section on article 11 on tobacco product packaging and labelling, Guyana did not provide any reported information.³¹

According to the Guyana Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were laws mandating specific warnings.³² Thus, Guyana complied with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Guyana Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.³³ Thus, Guyana did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Guyana Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are written in the principal language but warnings cover 0% of principal display area.³⁴ Thus, Guyana partially complied with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Guyana was assigned a score of 0 for partial compliance.

Haiti

No references.

Jamaica: +1

Jamaica fully complied with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

²⁸ PAHO, Grenada Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Grenada_CR.pdf

²⁹ PAHO, Grenada Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Grenada_CR.pdf

³⁰ PAHO, Grenada Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Grenada_CR.pdf

³¹ WHO FCTC, Guyana Implementation Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/guyana_report.pdf

³² PAHO, Guyana Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Guyana_CR.pdf

³³ PAHO, Guyana Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Guyana_CR.pdf

³⁴ PAHO, Guyana Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Guyana_CR.pdf

On 18 July 2008, Jamaica submitted an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database.³⁵ Under the section on article 11 on tobacco product packaging and labelling, Jamaica reported yes to “packaging and labelling [that] also carry health warnings describing the harmful effects of tobacco use” and to “packaging and labelling [that] contain information on relevant constituents and emissions of tobacco products.”³⁶ Jamaica thus fully complied with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Jamaica Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were laws mandating specific warnings.³⁷ Thus, Jamaica complied with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Jamaica Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.³⁸ Thus, Jamaica fully complied with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Jamaica Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are written in the principal language and warnings cover 30% of principal display area.³⁹ Thus, Jamaica fully complied with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Jamaica was assigned a score of +1 for full compliance.

Montserrat

No references.

Saint Kitts and Nevis: -1

Saint Kitts and Nevis did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

Saint Kitts and Nevis did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.⁴⁰

According to the Saint Kitts and Nevis Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.⁴¹ Thus, Saint Kitts and Nevis did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Saint Kitts and Nevis Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.⁴² Thus, Saint Kitts and Nevis did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

³⁵ WHO FCTC, Jamaica Report. Date Accessed: 1 July 2015. http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/jamaica_report.pdf

³⁶ WHO FCTC, Jamaica Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015. http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/sites/implementation/files/documents/reports/jamaica_report.pdf

³⁷ PAHO, Jamaica Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015. http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Jamaica_CR.pdf

³⁸ PAHO, Jamaica Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015. http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Jamaica_CR.pdf

³⁹ PAHO, Jamaica Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015. http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/Jamaica_CR.pdf

⁴⁰ WHO FCTC, Saint Kitts and Nevis. Date accessed: 1 July 2015. <http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Saint%20Kitts%20and%20Nevis>

⁴¹ PAHO, Saint Kitts and Nevis Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015. http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/StKittsandNevis_CR.pdf

According to the Saint Kitts and Nevis Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover 0% of principal display area.⁴³ Thus, Saint Kitts and Nevis did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Saint Kitts and Nevis was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Saint Lucia: -1

Saint Lucia did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

Saint Lucia did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.⁴⁴

According to the Saint Lucia Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.⁴⁵ Thus, Saint Lucia did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Saint Lucia Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and no information was provided on whether or not warnings describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.⁴⁶ Thus, Saint Lucia did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Saint Lucia Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there was no reported information on whether or not health warnings existed on each package and outside packaging and whether or not warnings are written in the principal language. It was reported that warnings cover 0% of principal display area.⁴⁷ Thus, Saint Lucia did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Saint Lucia was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines: -1

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.⁴⁸

According to the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.⁴⁹ Thus, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

⁴² PAHO, Saint Kitts and Nevis Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/StKittsandNevis_CR.pdf

⁴³ PAHO, Saint Kitts and Nevis Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/StKittsandNevis_CR.pdf

⁴⁴ WHO FCTC, Saint Lucia. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Saint%20Lucia>

⁴⁵ PAHO Saint Lucia Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/SaintLucia_CR.pdf

⁴⁶ PAHO Saint Lucia Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/SaintLucia_CR.pdf

⁴⁷ PAHO Saint Lucia Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/SaintLucia_CR.pdf

⁴⁸ WHO FCTC, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Saint%20Vincent%20and%20the%20Grenadines>

According to the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.⁵⁰ Thus, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover 0% of principal display area.⁵¹ Thus, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Suriname: -1

Suriname did not comply with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

Suriname did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.⁵²

According to the Suriname Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no laws mandating specific warnings.⁵³ Thus, Suriname did not comply with the legislative aspect of compliance.

According to the Suriname Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no bans on misleading descriptors, and warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.⁵⁴ Thus, Suriname did not comply with the content aspect of tobacco warning labels.

According to the Suriname Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were no health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are not written in the principal language and warnings cover 0% of principal display area.⁵⁵ Thus, Suriname did not comply with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Suriname was assigned a score of -1 for lack of compliance.

Trinidad and Tobago: 0

Trinidad and Tobago has partially complied with its commitment to insist on effective warning labels for tobacco.

⁴⁹ PAHO, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/SaintVinandtheGrenadines_CR.pdf

⁵⁰ PAHO, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/SaintVinandtheGrenadines_CR.pdf

⁵¹ PAHO, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/SaintVinandtheGrenadines_CR.pdf

⁵² WHO FCTC, Suriname. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Suriname>

⁵³ PAHO, Suriname Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/Suriname_CR.pdf

⁵⁴ PAHO, Suriname Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/Suriname_CR.pdf

⁵⁵ PAHO, Suriname Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/Suriname_CR.pdf

According to the Trinidad and Tobago Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were laws mandating specific warnings.⁵⁶ Thus, Trinidad and Tobago complied with the legislative aspect of compliance.

Trinidad and Tobago did not submit an implementation report to the FCTC Implementation Database during the compliance period.⁵⁷

According to the Trinidad and Tobago Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there are “bans on misleading descriptors such as ‘mild’, ‘low tar’, etc.,” but “warnings do not describe the harmful effects of tobacco use.”⁵⁸ Thus, Trinidad and Tobago partially complied with the content aspect of warning labels.

According to the Trinidad and Tobago Tobacco Control Report, as of 2008 there were health warnings on each package and outside packaging, warnings are written in the principal language, but warnings cover 0% of principal display area.⁵⁹ Thus, Trinidad and Tobago has partially complied with the effectiveness aspect of tobacco warning labels.

Trinidad and Tobago was assigned a score of 0 for partial compliance.

Turks and Caicos

No references.

⁵⁶ PAHO, Trinidad and Tobago Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/TrinidadandTobago_CR.pdf

⁵⁷ WHO FCTC, Trinidad and Tobago. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

<http://apps.who.int/fctc/implementation/database/parties/Trinidad%20and%20Tobago>

⁵⁸ PAHO, Trinidad and Tobago Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/TrinidadandTobago_CR.pdf

⁵⁹ PAHO, Trinidad and Tobago Tobacco Control Report. Date accessed: 1 July 2015.

http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2011/TrinidadandTobago_CR.pdf