



**University
of Victoria**

Canadian Institute
for Substance
Use Research

Institut canadien
de recherche sur
l'usage de substances

camh

Centre for Addiction and Mental Health
Centre de toxicomanie et de santé mentale



Canadian Institute
for Health Information
Institut canadien
d'information sur la santé

 **DALHOUSIE
UNIVERSITY** 1818
2018



Institut national
de santé publique
Québec


**ST. FRANCIS XAVIER
UNIVERSITY**

 **Western
Law**

Strategies to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harms and Costs in Canada: A Review of Federal Policies

Strategies to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harms and Costs in Canada: A Review of Federal Policies

Ashley Wettlaufer, Research Coordinator, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON

Kate Vallance, Research Associate, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria, BC

Clifton Chow, Research Affiliate, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria, BC

Tim Stockwell, Director, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria, BC

Norman Giesbrecht, Emeritus Scientist, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON

Nicole April, Medical Consultant, Institut national de santé publique du Québec, Québec City, QC

Mark Asbridge, Associate Professor, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS

Russell Callaghan, Scientist, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria; Professor, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, BC

Samantha Cukier, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

Geoff Hynes, Manager, Canadian Institute for Health Information, Ottawa, ON

Robert Mann, Senior Scientist, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON

Robert Solomon, Professor Emeritus, Western University, London, ON

Gerald Thomas, Collaborating Scientist, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research; Director, BC Ministry of Health, Victoria, BC

Kara Thompson, Assistant Professor, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, NS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all of the individuals working across a variety of relevant federal agencies who provided policy information in support of this report. We are grateful support provided for the analysis of federal law provided by Caitlin Stockwell, University of Victoria. We thank also the Public Health Agency of Canada for their financial support. The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the perspectives of the organisations acknowledged.

Suggested citation: Wettlaufer, A., Vallance, K., Chow, C., Stockwell, T., Giesbrecht, N., April, N., Asbridge, M., Callaghan, R.C., Cukier, S., Hynes, G., Mann, R., Solomon, R., Thomas, G., Thompson, K. (2019). Strategies to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harms and Costs in Canada: A Review of Federal Policies. Victoria, BC: Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, University of Victoria.

APPENDIX B: Federal Alcohol Policy Domain and Indicator Scoring Rubric and Scores

1. PRICING AND TAXATION	INDICATOR DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Minimum Pricing for alcohol sold on federally controlled lands/waters	<p>1a. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they implement indexed minimum unit pricing (iMUP) for all liquor sold on federally controlled lands and waters (i.e. parks, military installations, boats owned by Canadian persons or businesses)</p> <p>1b. Discounting: The jurisdiction was scored on whether they allow for any discounting or iMUP loopholes on federally controlled lands/waters</p>	0/1.5	<p>1a. iMUP for liquor sold in federally control areas (0-0.75) 0= No iMUP on federal controlled land/waters 0.2= Some components of iMUP implemented in federally controlled land /waters 0.75= iMUP fully implemented in federally controlled land/waters</p> <p>1b. Federal iMUP loopholes and discounting (0-0.75) 0= no minimum prices or loopholes that undermine iMUP on federally controlled lands/waters 0.75= No iMUP loopholes</p>
2. Volumetric taxation	2. The jurisdiction was scored on the proportion of federal alcohol taxes that are volumetric versus not (i.e. GST).	0.96/3.0	2. Proportion of volumetric taxation (0-3.0) A maximum of 3 points were awarded based on the proportion of federal alcohol taxes collected by volumetric excise versus sales tax or flat excise tax.
3. Volumetric excise tax	3. The jurisdiction was scored on the degree to which the excise tax reflects alcohol content within each major beverage type.	1.39/5.5	<p>3. Excise taxes tied to alcohol content within a beverage type (0-5.5) 0= flat excise taxes A maximum of 4 points for volumetric excise taxes, with no loopholes (e.g. no discounts or exemptions), for beer wine and spirits, weighted to reflect their proportion of sales based on estimated ethanol content by beverage type. In the case of excise tax exemptions or discounts, a score of zero was applied to the proportion of</p>

			products that would benefit from the discount and exemption. 1.5 additional points were awarded for having the same rate per litre of ethanol applied across all beverage types.
2. PHYSICAL AVAILABILITY	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Importing of alcohol into the country (cross national borders)	<p>1. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they:</p> <p>1a. impose restrictions on permitted duty exempt import volumes across national borders that are inscribed in legislation</p> <p>1b. set maximum duty exempt import volumes that effectively discourage cross border shopping</p>	10/10	<p>1a. Legislated alcohol import volumes (0-5) 0= Import volumes are not inscribed in legislation 5= Limits on the import volumes of alcohol products are inscribed in legislation</p> <p>1b. Import volumes to discourage cross border shopping (0-5) 0= No restrictions on import volumes or import volumes set to a level that could encourage cross-border shopping 5= Import volumes are set to effectively discourage cross-border shopping</p>

3. IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTER-MEASURES	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Impaired driving code (e.g. federal <i>Criminal Code</i> limit at .05)	1. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had made it a criminal offence to drive with a BAC of .05% or higher	0/3	1. Impaired driving <i>Criminal Code</i> (0-3) 0= The <i>Criminal Code</i> threshold for driving under the influence is set higher than a BAC of .05% 3= It is a criminal offence to drive with a BAC of .05% or higher.
2. Random breath testing	2. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had enacted random breath testing legislation	5/7 See footnote ⁹	2. Random breath testing legislation (0-7) 0= No random breath testing legislation 7= Random breath testing legislation is in place
4. MARKETING/ ADVERTISING CONTROLS	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing and advertising restrictions	1. The jurisdiction was scored on the comprehensiveness of their alcohol marketing and advertising regulations, including whether they had: 1a. Content-specific restrictions 1b. Location-specific restrictions 1c. Event specific restrictions (i.e. sponsorship)	1/3	1a-c. Comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing regulations (0-3) 1 point each for alcohol marketing regulations pertaining to: a. content, b. location, c. specific events

⁹ On June 21 2018 Bill C-46 received royal assent. Random breath testing came into effect in December 2018.

<p>2. Coverage of alcohol marketing and advertising restrictions</p>	<p>2. The jurisdiction was scored on the coverage of their alcohol marketing and advertising regulations, including whether they had:</p> <p>2a. advertiser-specific restrictions</p> <p>2b. medium- or channel-specific restrictions,</p> <p>2c. quantity/volume restrictions</p>	<p>1/3</p>	<p>2a-c. Coverage of alcohol marketing restrictions (0-3) 1 point each for alcohol marketing regulations pertaining to: a. all advertisers, b. all channels of advertising, c. the volume of marketing</p>
<p>3. Enforcement of advertising and marketing regulations</p>	<p>3. The jurisdiction was scored on whether:</p> <p>3a. they had an independent authority, to i. implement, ii. monitor, iii. enforce, and iv. report on compliance with the law or, in the absence of legislation, industry self-regulatory codes</p> <p>3b. the independent authority had a mandatory process for submitting marketing materials for pre-clearance by an independent authority</p> <p>3c. the independent authority had an established system for receiving complaints</p>	<p>0/3</p>	<p>3a. Advertising Authority (0-1) 0.00= no independent authority 0.25 point each for an independent authority that i. implements, ii. monitors, iii. enforces and iv. reports on compliance.</p> <p>3b. Pre-screening system (0-0.5) 0.0= no mandatory pre-screening or voluntary pre-screening only 0.5= mandatory pre-screening by an independent authority</p> <p>3c. Complaint system (0-0.5) 0.0= no formal complaint process 0.5= a formal complaint process</p>

	3d. the independent authority has sufficient enforcement powers, including the ability to levy meaningful sanctions that are commensurate with the violation and that escalate with the frequency of the violation.		3d. Penalties for violation (0-1) 0.0= no penalties 0.5= penalties commensurate with the violations 1.0= penalties commensurate with the violations and that escalate for repeat violations
4. Monitoring	4. The jurisdiction was scored on whether the agency collects information from the alcohol industry on marketing activities, including expenditures and areas of activity and, in the interest of transparency, whether this information is made public to support evaluation and research	0/1	4. Monitoring and Reporting (0-1) 0.5 points each for a. monitoring the alcohol industry on marketing activities and b. making the information publicly available
5. MINIMUM LEGAL DRINKING AGE	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Purchase Age	1a. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they set a federal minimum legal purchase age under the <i>Criminal Code</i> 1b. The jurisdiction was scored on the level of the federal minimum legal purchase age for alcohol.	0/10	1a. Federal purchase age (0-2.5) 0= no federal purchase age for alcohol 2.5= federal purchase age for alcohol 1b. Level of federal minimum legal purchase age (0-7.5) 0= no minimum purchase age or age below 19 2.5= minimum purchase age of 19 5.0= minimum purchase age of 20 7.5= minimum purchase age of 21

6. SCREENING, BRIEF INTERVENTION AND REFERRAL	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Federal support for SBIR programs	<p>1a. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide funding for provincial and/or territorial level SBIR activities either specifically or as part of a comprehensive mental health or substance misuse package.</p> <p>1b The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide tools to support SBIR activities across the P/Ts.</p>	4.5/4.5	<p>1a. Federal funding for SBIR activities (0-1) 0= no federal funding available 1= federally funding available to provinces and/or territories for alcohol SBIR activities</p> <p>1b. Federal SBIR tools (0-3.5) 0= no tools available 1.16 points each for federal SBIR tools for implementation with the general population, women of child bearing age and pregnant women, and other at risk groups.</p>
2. Federal SBIR initiatives	<p>2. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they conduct SBIR within populations under federal control, such as:</p> <p>a. Corrections populations, b. Military population, c. Federal employees</p>	4.75/5.5	<p>2. SBIR activities for populations under federal control</p> <p>a-b. For federally incarcerated individuals and military population (0-4): 1.5 points each for general counselling programs only, 2 points each for alcohol SBIR program</p> <p>c. For federal employees (0-1.5): 0.75 points for general counselling programs, 1.5 points for alcohol SBIR program</p>

7. LIQUOR LAW ENFORCEMENT	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8. CONTROL SYSTEM	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Protecting government control and public health	<p>1a. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal incentives or measures for maintaining government control over the retail sale and distribution of alcohol</p> <p>1b. the jurisdiction was scored on whether there are trade law exemptions, including those specifically for alcohol, that are permitted in the interests of protecting public health and safety. (Note: focused on NAFTA)</p>	4/8	<p>1a. Federal incentives for government control of alcohol sales and distribution (0-4) 0=No federal incentives to encourage government control of the distribution and sale of alcohol 2= federal measures to preserve the public monopolies are in place 4= Federal incentives to encourage government control of the distribution and sale of alcohol</p> <p>1b. Trade law exemptions (0-4) 0= no trade law exemptions to protect public health and safety 2= trade law exemptions do exist in order to protect public health and safety 4= trade law exemptions, specific to alcohol, exist in order to protect public health and safety</p>
2. Regulation of Duty Free outlets	2. The jurisdiction was scored on whether Duty Free outlets are government run for the purposes of minimising health and safety harms	0/2	2. Government control of Duty Free outlets (0-2) The jurisdiction was scored on the proportion of Duty Free outlets that were government licensed, owned and run, versus government licensed and privately owned and run.

9. NATIONAL ALCOHOL STRATEGY	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Implementation of a national alcohol strategy (NAS)	<p>1. The national alcohol strategy was scored on:</p> <p>1a. Whether the National Alcohol Strategy is funded</p> <p>1b. Whether the National Alcohol Strategy has an identified leader</p> <p>1c. Whether the National Alcohol Strategy leadership and committee does not include private industry (e.g. manufacturers, and private retailers)</p> <p>1d. Recency of the National Alcohol Strategy</p>	0/4	<p>1a. National alcohol strategy funding (0-2) 0= No national alcohol strategy or strategy is not funded 1.0= Strategy is partially funded (e.g. no project/activity funding) 2.0= Strategy is fully funded</p> <p>1b. National Alcohol Strategy Leadership (0-2) 0= No national alcohol strategy or strategy exists but has no leadership 1.0= Clearly identified leadership 2.0= Clearly identified leader that includes formal multisector partnerships</p> <p>1c. Independence of the national alcohol strategy (penalty of 0-2) 0= No involvement of industry in the NAS development 2= Involvement of industry in the NAS development</p> <p>1d. Recency of the strategy (penalty of 0-1) 0 points were deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was</p>

			<p>created or updated in the past 5 years 0.5 points were deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was developed or last updated 6-9 years ago. 1.0 point was deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was developed or last updated 10 or more years ago.</p>
2. Evidence-based NAS recommendations	<p>2. Jurisdictions were scored on whether the above mentioned strategy included a wide range of evidence-based alcohol policy interventions. E.g. (a.) Pricing & taxation, (b.) physical availability, (c.) impaired driving countermeasures, (d.) marketing and advertising controls, (e.) minimum legal drinking age, (f.) screening brief intervention and referral, and (g.) liquor law enforcement</p>	2/6	<p>2. Evidence based strategy recommendations (0-6) 50% penalty if recommendations that are not federally endorsed 0= no strategy that includes alcohol 1= strategy includes recommendations from 1-2 evidence-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B 2= strategy includes recommendations from 3-4 evidence-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B 4= strategy includes recommendations from 5-6 evidence-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B 6= strategy includes recommendations from all 7 evidenced-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B</p>

10. NATIONAL MONITORING AND REPORTING	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Federal funding for a National Alcohol Monitoring program	<p>1. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that:</p> <p>1a. Tracks the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Alcohol consumption by sales and survey data ii. Alcohol-related morbidity iii. Alcohol-related mortality iv. Alcohol-related crime v. Alcohol-related costs <p>1b. Provides reporting at regular intervals</p>	8.175/10	<p>1a. Alcohol indicator tracking (0-4) 0= no funding for reporting activities 0.25 points for each alcohol indicator that is partially tracked (e.g. a few relevant measures are tracked) 0.5 points for each alcohol indicator that is somewhat comprehensively tracked (e.g. several measures are tracked but the set of measures fails to provide a complete picture of the issue) 0.75 points for each alcohol indicator that is comprehensively tracked. 0.375 points for each alcohol indicator that is partially tracked (e.g. only specific alcohol-related crimes and/or health conditions). An additional 0.25 points for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 5 alcohol indicators.</p> <p>1b. Frequency of reporting (0-4) 0= no funding for reporting activities 0.20 points per alcohol indicator for reporting every 6 years or longer 0.40 points per alcohol indicator for reporting every</p>

	1c. Requires transparency of reporting as a condition of funding		<p>4-5 years 0.60 points per alcohol indicator for reporting every 2-3 years 0.80 points per alcohol indicator reported annually</p> <p>1c. Funding conditional on transparency of reporting (0-2) 0= no funding for reporting activities 2= Making information publicly available is a condition of funding</p>
11. HEALTH/SAFETY MESSAGING	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Alcohol labelling	<p>1a. The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory alcohol labels that included the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a warning message ii. standard drink information iii. the low-risk drinking guidelines. <p>1b. The jurisdiction was scored on the quality of the alcohol label components</p>	0/3	<p>1a. comprehensiveness of labelling components (0-2) 0= No alcohol labelling 0.66 pts for warning messages pertaining to any of the following alcohol-related risks: pregnancy/FASD, impaired driving/injury, underage drinking and chronic disease; 0.66 points for standard drink information; 0.66 points for LRDG information (link to LRDG website earns half points)</p> <p>1b. labelling component quality (0-1) 0= No alcohol labelling 0.25 points each for any of the following quality indicators: large labels; prominent labels; coloured/contrast labels; pictogram or graphic to support text</p>

<p>2. Health and Safety Messaging</p>	<p>2. Scored on the comprehensiveness of health messaging, including:</p> <p>2a. Federal endorsement and promotion of the LRDGs</p> <p>2b. Comprehensiveness of current evidence-based alcohol messaging on Health Canada website with regards to: pregnancy/FASD; impaired driving/injury; underage drinking; acute effects; chronic disease; treatment resources</p> <p>2c. Federal requirement for the inclusion of a clear evidenced based standardised health and safety message in all alcohol advertising and marketing activities</p>	<p>1/7</p>	<p>2a. Federal endorsement and promotion of the LRDGs (0-1) 0= No national LRDGs 0.5= LRDGs developed by a credible organisation but have not been federally endorsed or promoted 0.75= federal endorsement of LRDGs, but no promotion 1= LRDGs have been federally endorsed and widely promoted at the federal level</p> <p>2b. Comprehensiveness of alcohol messaging on Health Canada website (0-0.5) 0= fewer than half the topics covered 0.25= between 4-5 topics covered 0.5= all topics covered</p> <p>2c. Mandatory health and safety messages (0-0.5) 0= no mandatory or voluntary suggested health and safety message(s) 0.25= suggested voluntary health and safety message(s) 0.5= mandatory health and safety message to be included in all alcohol advertising and marketing</p>
---------------------------------------	---	-------------------	---

	<p>2d. Multi-media campaigns to raise awareness were assessed based on:</p> <p>i. The variation in messaging. i.e. whether a jurisdiction had messaging around a variety of alcohol-related health and safety topics.</p> <p>ii. The quality of the message(s) i.e. whether the message contained a clear health messages and was accompanied by graphics</p> <p>iii. Main media for health & safety messaging by Health Canada: a checklist of media types was the basis for measuring this indicator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Posters 2) Pamphlets 3) Billboards 4) Online content (websites) 5) Print Advertising 6) TV/Radio advertisements 7) Social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) <p>Other: _____</p>	<p>2di. Variation in messaging (0-2) (0.4 points max for each messaging category)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)/pregnancy -Drinking and driving or acute injury -Minors -Chronic disease, cancer or health -Moderate consumption (Low-Risk Drinking Guidelines) <p>ii. Quality of messages (0-2) (0.4 points max for each messaging category)</p> <p>Quality is assessed by the precision of the message, the health focus, accompanying graphics etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)/pregnancy -Drinking and driving or acute injury -Minors -Chronic disease, cancer or health - Moderate consumption (LRDGs) <p>iii. Main media for health & safety (HS) messaging (0-1)</p> <p>0.00= no HS messaging 0.25= HS messaging using 1-2 media 0.50= HS messaging using 3-4 media 0.75= HS messaging using 5-6 media 1.00= HS messaging using 7 or more media</p>
--	--	---