Implementing Tobacco Harm Reduction in Health Policy

What is the objective of tobacco harm reduction policy?

An evidence-based tobacco harm reduction (THR) policy exists to reduce deaths and disease caused by combustible tobacco. Its operational objective should be explicit: to accelerate cessation and switching among adults who smoke, while preventing youth initiation, limiting marketing-driven uptake, and containing unintended consequences. THR is not "pro-nicotine"; it is a risk-management strategy focused on moving people away from combustion and unsafe oral tobacco products, which are the dominant drivers of harm in Asia Pacific, by permitting tightly controlled access to lower-risk alternatives where the evidence supports public health benefit.

What does the evidence support today?

Evidence syntheses indicate that nicotine e-cigarettes can improve smoking cessation outcomes compared with nicotine replacement therapy (NRT)[1]. This matters for policy design because public health benefit derives from adults who smoke fully switching away from combustible products, not from growth in nicotine use itself. A practical THR policy therefore treats switching and cessation as the primary outcomes and designs the system around making those outcomes achievable, measurable, and sustained.

How do governments implement THR without increasing youth uptake?

Building a resilient THR approach requires two tracks at once: an adult switching and cessation pathway designed to reduce smoking, one that is accessible, clinically supported, and integrated into stop-smoking services. The second is a youth-protection and marketing-control regime designed to prevent uptake and renormalisation of smoking[2]. Both tracks are essential; prioritising only one creates predictable policy failure.

What is risk-proportionate regulation in nicotine policy?

Implementation should be grounded in risk-proportionate regulation: products that are demonstrably less harmful than smoking must also be safer in practice through enforceable product standards, quality controls, and active compliance oversight. In parallel, regulation should make these products less accessible and less attractive to minors through strict retail rules, age verification, packaging and promotion constraints, and meaningful penalties for breaches. This is what "safer than smoking" means in operational terms, not just in rhetoric.

---

[1] https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD010216.pub9/pdf/full
[2] ibid.

Why is New Zealand often cited as a workable model?

In the Asia–Pacific region, New Zealand provides a practical regulatory scaffold for vaping and other regulated products through the Smokefree Environments and Regulated Products Act 1990, associated regulations, and Ministry of Health guidance for retailers and suppliers. The model is operationally useful because it combines clear obligations for manufacturers, importers, and retailers—including product notification requirements—with government-led compliance tools, while embedding THR into cessation services so adult switching is not dependent on consumer marketing to drive change[3]. New Zealand's smoking decline illustrates what a sustained, system-level approach can deliver: adult daily smoking fell from 16.4% (2011/12) to about 6.8–6.9% in recent survey years, which is a substantial reduction over roughly a decade[4].

How do you keep THR policy evidence-based over time?

To keep THR policy grounded in evidence rather than doctrine, governments should publish a standing evidence statement that clearly separates what the evidence supports today, what is uncertain, and what new findings would trigger policy change. England's vaping evidence update model shows the value of a refreshable, government-owned evidence product that can be updated on a defined cycle rather than re-litigated from scratch each year.[5,6]

How should THR be delivered in practice?

THR performs best when delivered as a structured pathway within the health system under the smoking cessation umbrella. A service-led approach reduces ideological noise, increases consistency, and focuses activity on measurable outcomes such as quit success and sustained switching. Workforce guidance should cover how to support switching, how to minimise prolonged dual use, and how to support people who want to stop vaping after they have stopped smoking.

New Zealand has begun building this kind of practice guidance, including health-worker guidance focused on supporting people to stop vaping and using vaping to stop smoking and this is the direction that reduces ideological noise and increases consistent delivery[7].

How do you futureproof a THR framework?

A futureproof THR policy is designed to adapt as the evidence base, products, and markets change. It should operate like any other monitored public health intervention, with defined indicators such as adult smoking prevalence, quit rates, switching rates, duration of dual use, youth uptake, product compliance failures, adverse event signals, and displacement of illicit markets. Review points should be pre-committed, with clear rules for when settings tighten or relax based on measured outcomes. This is how governments avoid "policy by belief" and instead run THR as a governed, testable intervention. Government evaluation guidance is explicit that evaluation should be incorporated through design, implementation, delivery, and

---

[3] Smokefree Environments and Regulated Products Act 1990
[4] Trends in smoking and vaping: New Zealand Health Survey 2023/24
[5] Nicotine vaping in England: 2022 evidence update - GOV.UK
[6] Tobacco: preventing uptake, promoting quitting and treating dependence | Guidance | NICE
[7] Guidance for Health Workers supporting people to stop vaping and using vaping to stop smoking

review so THR policy is continuously tested against its intended outcomes rather than defended as doctrine[8].

Why communications matter in tobacco harm reduction policy

Public communications should be treated as a core policy tool. Misperceptions about relative risk can reduce switching among adults who smoke and increase confusion among youth. Government messaging should therefore hold two truths at once: vaping is not risk-free, and for adults who smoke, switching away from combustion can reduce harm. This balance is consistent with evidence synthesis on cessation benefits and with regulator-led approaches that pair adult quitting support with strong youth controls[9].

Why this matters for Asia–Pacific

New Zealand's experience demonstrates that a tightly regulated, service-supported THR approach can coincide with large, sustained reductions in smoking prevalence. The strategic lesson for Asia–Pacific is direct: modern THR policy is achievable when governments combine risk-proportionate regulation, strong youth protections, health-system delivery, and a defined evidence-and-outcomes update cycle—especially in a region that bears a high burden of harm from combustible tobacco and high-risk oral products[10].

C.Y. Virgino - clarisse@caphraorg.net
N.E. Loucas - neloucas@caphraorg.net

March 2026

---

[8] Magenta Book: Central Government guidance on evaluation (HTML) - GOV.UK
[9] https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD010216.pub9/pdf/full
[10] Health at a Glance: Asia/Pacific 2022 | OECD