

**QoN 003-01** In your submission you state that *“the restriction of nicotine vaping products to sale by chemists after a GP visit is problematic”* because *“it will require a significant number of Medicare funded GP appointments that could be better utilised by our health system.*

How many additional GP appointments does Ampol believe will happen as a result of *“the restriction of nicotine vaping products to sale by chemists after a GP visit”*?

It is self-evident that at least one GP appointment would be required for each smoker who wishes to switch. There may also be multiple appointments sought by a smoker who wished to switch to vaping whose GP pushes other quit products which would illuminate nicotine addition all together.

Ampol has submitted that if a person is motivated to switch to vaping and wants to make that choice, they could make that choice at a retail setting where they would normally purchase cigarettes.

If a smoker or nicotine-vaper is interested in quitting nicotine addiction, a GP visit would be appropriate.

b. What modelling has Ampol done to back up this claim?

*We have not conducted modelling on this claim but note from media reports that other individuals and organisations may be better placed to provide further information.*

Does Ampol have any modelling it can point to back up this claim?

*No, Ampol has not invested in this type of modelling and it is unlikely that we would do so.*

If so, please provide the modelling to the committee.

NA

**QoN 003-02** What does Ampol/Caltex anticipate being the market value of allowing nicotine e-cigarettes to be available for sale as a consumer product?

*Using New Zealand as the most comparable market, we estimate the Australian market could be worth approximately \$1.66 billion.*

**QoN 003-03** Has Ampol/Caltex done any modelling of what the value of being able to sell nicotine e-cigarette products at their stores would be worth to them?

*No, we are relying on external sources for the above estimate.*

**QoN 003-04** If Ampol/Caltex was able to legally sell e-cigarettes as a reduced harm product, would it discontinue the sale of traditional combustible cigarettes?

*Ampol would continue to offer customers a choice of products while ever the sale of those products is legal and it remains economic to do so.*

**QoN 003-05** Does Ampol/Caltex have any plans to phase or stop the sale of traditional combustible cigarettes?

No

**QoN 003-06** Do any Ampol/Caltex sell e-cigarettes currently?

*We have trialled the sale of non-nicotine e-cigarettes.*

**QoN 003-09** Has Ampol made submissions to the Department of Health regarding the regulation of e-cigarettes in the past five years?

*No*

**QoN 003-10** Has Ampol made submissions to the Therapeutic Goods Administration regarding the regulation of e-cigarettes in the past five years?

*No*

**QoN 003-11** Please indicate if Ampol consulted any of the below groups about your submission to this inquiry, or regarding your policy on vaping, tobacco, nicotine or any related products:

- a. The Institute for Public Affairs;
- b. Centre for Independent Studies;
- c. The Sydney Institute;
- d. Australian Taxpayers Alliance;
- e. Australian Institute For Progress;
- f. Mannkal Economic Education Foundation; and
- g. any ATLAS network member organization

*No*