



Policy Scoring Rubric

(Federal)

Suggested citation: Naimi, T., Stockwell, T., Giesbrecht, N., Wettlaufer, A., Vallance, K., Farrell-Low, A., Farkouh, E., Ma, J., Priore, B., Vishnevsky, N., Price, T., Asbridge, M., Gagnon, M., Hynes, G., Shelley, J., Sherk, A., Shield, K., Solomon, R., Thomas, G. & Thompson, K. (2023). Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation (CAPE) 3.0: Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal). Victoria, BC: Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, University of Victoria.

Acknowledgments: Thank you to all federal, provincial and territorial stakeholders who provided valuable feedback for this project as well as assisting with data collection and validation activities. Thanks also to our three external expert reviewers, all the extended members of the project team, and our CAPE Community of Practice.

Funding: This project was funded primarily by Health Canada's Substance Use and Addictions Program. Additional funds were provided by the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada or the other organizations acknowledged.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
1. Pricing and Taxation	10		3.89
1.1 Minimum Pricing	2		0
1.1a. Financial incentives for P/T minimum pricing The jurisdiction was scored on whether they make use of financial incentives for implementing a minimum price at the provincial/territorial level.	1.5	0.00= No financial incentives, 1.50= Financial incentives to encourage minimum pricing implementation at the P/T level.	0
1.1b. Minimum pricing in federally control areas The jurisdiction was scored on whether they implement minimum prices for all alcohol sold on federally controlled lands and waters (i.e. parks, military installations, boats owned by Canadian persons or businesses) with the ideal being an indexed minimum unit price (iMUP).	0.5	0= No minimum prices for federal controlled land/waters, 0.25= Some components of iMUP implemented in federally controlled land /waters, 0.50= iMUP fully implemented in federally, controlled land/waters.	0
1.1c. Federal minimum price loopholes The jurisdiction was scored on whether they allow for any discounting or minimum pricing loopholes on federally controlled lands/waters.	-0.125	0.125 points were deducted for the minimum pricing score if the jurisdiction had any minimum pricing loopholes that undermine minimum prices on federally controlled lands/waters.	0
1.2. Alcohol Sales Taxes	2.25		1
1.2a. Level of federal sales tax (ad valorem- % of price) The jurisdiction was scored on the level of federal sales taxes applied to alcohol (e.g. GST or other ad valorem federal alcohol sales tax).	2.25	0.00 = federal alcohol sales tax rate < 5%, 1.00 = federal alcohol sales tax rate between 5-8%, 1.50 = federal alcohol sales tax rate between 9-12%, 2.25 = federal alcohol sales tax rate > 12%.	1
1.3. Alcohol Excise Taxes	5.5		2.81
1.3a. Level of excise tax on alcohol products (tax per unit volume) The jurisdiction was scored on the level of alcohol excise tax the jurisdiction imposes on alcohol products prior to applying the GST rate. The jurisdiction was scored against an ideal of a unified alcohol volumetric rate of \$13.04/ L ethanol for spirits and \$8.75/L ethanol for non-spirits (e.g. beer and wine) based on a stepped approach for moving towards a unified rate across all beverage types. Ideal rates account for an 85% upward adjustment for lack of indexation between 1991 and 2017.	2.5	The score was determined based on the proportion of the actual alcohol excise tax rate against the ideal rates of \$13.04/L ethanol for high strength spirits and \$8.75/L ethanol for non-spirit and low strength spirit beverages.	1.15

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>1.3b. Ethanol-based volumetric excise tax by beverage category The jurisdiction was scored on the degree to which the excise tax reflects alcohol content within each major beverage category.</p>	2.5	<p>0.00 = flat excise taxes (rate per L beverage), A maximum of 2 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 category. In the case of excise tax exemptions or discounts, a score of zero was applied to the proportion of products that would benefit from the discount and exemption. 0.50 additional points were awarded for having the same rate per litre of ethanol applied across all beverage categories.</p>	1.15
<p>1.3c. Indexation of excise taxes The jurisdiction was scored on whether there was indexation of excise taxes for all beverage types.</p>	0.5	<p>0.00 = excise tax is not indexed, 0.50 = Ad valorem excise tax rate structure (automatically adjusts for changes in price) or flat rate excise tax is indexed annually to CPI within each beverage type.</p>	0.5
<p>1.4. Proportion of ethanol-based volumetric taxation</p>	0.25		0.082
<p>1.4a. Practice Indicator - Ethanol-based volumetric taxation The jurisdiction was scored on the proportion of all federal alcohol taxes (i.e., excise taxes and GST) that are volumetric versus not.</p>	0.25	<p>A maximum of 0.25 points were awarded based on the proportion of federal alcohol taxes collected by volumetric excise versus sales tax or flat excise tax.</p>	0.081889

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
2. Marketing and Advertising Controls	10		1
2.1. Comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing and advertising restrictions for mass media	6		0.5
<p>2.1a. Ad bans and volume restrictions Jurisdiction scored on whether there were advertising bans or restrictions on the volume of alcohol advertising permitted, across all media types (e.g. advertising bans or restrictions on the number of ads or % of ad space occupied by alcohol ads etc.), regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p>	2.5	<p>Jurisdiction awarded full points on indicators 1a-1d for a complete advertising ban. If no full ban on alcohol advertising, the following scores for volume restrictions were applied to each of the following media types: +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for broadcast media (radio and television), +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for online media services (Netflix etc.), +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for internet, +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for social media.</p>	0
<p>2.1b. Content restrictions Jurisdiction scored on content restrictions that go beyond the CRTC code for all media types regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p>	1	<p>Jurisdiction awarded the following scores for content restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.25 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.25 Online media services (e.g. Netflix etc.), +0.25 Internet, +0.25 social media.</p>	0
<p>2.1c. Placement restrictions Jurisdiction scored on restrictions on the placement of advertisements within all media types (e.g. restrictions prohibiting alcohol ads in media where the target audience is under the minimum legal age), regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private), in order to minimize alcohol advertisement exposure of priority populations (e.g. youth, individuals in recovery).</p>	1	<p>Jurisdiction awarded the following scores for placement restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.25 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.25 Online media services (e.g. Netflix etc.), +0.25 Internet, +0.25 Social media.</p>	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>2.1d. Price-based promotions ban Jurisdiction scored on restrictions on price-based marketing strategies/promotions, beyond policies prohibiting the advertisement of alcohol below the minimum price (e.g. policies restricting the advertisement of “cheap” drinks or specials), across all media types and regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p>	0.5	<p>Jurisdiction awarded the following scores for price-based promotion restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.125 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.125 Online media services (e.g. Netflix etc.), +0.125 Internet, +0.125 Social media.</p>	0
<p>2.1e. Restrictions by advertiser type Jurisdiction scored on whether they had restrictions on alcohol advertisements by non-licensees (e.g., third parties not involved in the production, manufacturing, or sale of alcohol including food delivery services).</p>	0.5	<p>0.00 = third party permitted to advertise alcohol, 0.50 = third party not permitted to advertise alcohol.</p>	0
<p>2.1f. Coverage of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations across advertisers The jurisdiction was scored on whether their alcohol advertising restrictions (see 2.1 a-d) applied to all advertisers (e.g. government retailers, private retailers and licencees, FOPs, manufacturers and their agents, SOP holders).</p>	0.5	<p>0.00 = No marketing restrictions or marketing restrictions do not apply to all advertisers, 0.50 = Marketing restrictions apply to all advertisers, including government retailers.</p>	0.5
<p>2.2. Enforcement of marketing and advertising regulations</p>	3		0.5
<p>2.2a. Mandatory pre-screening of advertising Jurisdiction was scored on whether they had a mandatory pre-screening process across media types, regardless of the advertiser, that was conducted by a representative independent from the alcohol industry and alcohol sales, for ensuring alcohol advertisements adhere to the regulations.</p>	1.5	<p>+0.375 for Pre-screening for broadcast media (radio and television), +0.375 for Pre-screening for online streaming services, +0.375 for Pre-screening for internet, +0.375 for Pre-screening for social media. Note: total up to a max of 1.5 points</p>	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>2.2b. Enforcement authority over alcohol advertising The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had a specific health and/or safety oriented authority, independent from industry and alcohol sales, responsible for enforcement regardless of advertiser (i.e., government or private).</p>	0.25	<p>0.00 = No independent health/safety authority responsible for enforcement, 0.125 = An independent health/safety authority responsible for enforcement, but some advertisers (e.g. government stores) are exempt, 0.25 = An independent health/safety authority, free from industry, responsible for enforcement with no exemptions. Note: total up to a max of 0.25 points</p>	0
<p>2.2ci. Independent online complaints system Jurisdiction was scored on whether the authority had an established an independent online system for receiving complaints geared to the lay public, independent from industry and alcohol and sales.</p>	0.25	<p>0.00 = no online formal independent complaint process, 0.25 = online formal independent complaint process.</p>	0
<p>2.2cii. Timelines for complaint adjudication Jurisdiction was scored on timelines for complaint adjudication (e.g., occurring within 30 days).</p>	0.25	<p>0.00 = no defined timelines, 0.25 = adjudication timelines do not exceed 30 days.</p>	0
<p>2.2d. Penalties for advertising violations Jurisdiction was scored on whether 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.</p>	0.5	<p>0.00 = no penalties, 0.25 = penalties commensurate with the violations, 0.50 = penalties commensurate with the violations and that escalate for repeat violation.</p>	0.25
<p>2.2e. Publicly available listings of violations Jurisdiction scored on whether they have a publicly available listing of violations of the alcohol advertising and marketing regulations that includes the name of the advertiser and nature of the violation.</p>	0.25	<p>0.00 = Absence of publicly available listings of violations, 0.25 = Presence of publicly available listings of violations.</p>	0.25

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
2.3. Monitoring and public reporting of alcohol industry marketing activities	1		0
2.3a. Monitoring of alcohol industry marketing activities The jurisdiction was scored on whether the authority collects information from the alcohol industry on marketing activities, including expenditures and areas of activity.	0.5	0.00 = no monitoring of alcohol industry marketing activities, 0.50 = monitoring the alcohol industry on marketing activities.	0
2.3b. Public reporting of alcohol industry marketing activities The jurisdiction was scored on whether, in the interest of transparency, the independent authority makes this information from the alcohol industry on marketing activities public to support evaluation and research.	0.5	0.00 = no public reporting of alcohol industry marketing activities, 0.50 = information is publicly available.	0
3. Impaired Driving Countermeasures	10		4
3.1. Impaired driving BAC limits for general population	4		0
3.1a. BAC limits for general population (e.g. federal <i>Criminal Code</i> limit at 0.05) The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had made it a federal criminal offence to drive with a BAC of 0.05% or higher.	4	0.00 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> threshold for driving under the influence is set higher than a BAC of 0.05%, 4.00 = It is a federal criminal offence to drive with a BAC of 0.05% or higher.	0
3.2. Impaired driving BAC limits for federally regulated professionals	1		0
3.2a. BAC limits for federally regulated professionals The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had made it a federal criminal offence for federally regulated professionals to operate commercial or passenger vehicles, trains, plane, and boats with a BAC > 0.02%.	1	0.00 = Maximum BAC level for federally regulated commercial drivers is > 0.02% or no applicable <i>Criminal Code</i> provision, 1.00 = Maximum BAC level for federally regulated commercial drivers is 0.02% or lower.	0
3.3. Breath testing legislation	2.5		2.5
3.3a. Random breath testing legislation The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had enacted random breath testing legislation	2.5	0.00 = No random breath testing legislation, 2.50 = Random breath testing legislation is in place.	2.5

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
3.4. Evidentiary blood samples	1.5		0.5
<p>3.4a. Evidentiary blood samples The jurisdiction was scored on whether the police are empowered under the <i>Criminal Code</i> to demand an evidentiary blood sample in any situation in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample.</p>	1.5	<p>0.00 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> does not empower police to demand evidentiary blood samples in any situation in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample, 0.50 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> empowers policy to demand evidentiary blood samples in some situations in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample. 1.50 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> empowers policy to demand evidentiary blood samples in any situation in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample.</p>	0.5
3.5. Tracking of impaired driving statistics	1		1
<p>3.5a. Tracking of impaired driving statistics The jurisdiction was scored on whether it had a system for the timely, accurate, and comprehensive collection and publishing of alcohol-related transportation deaths and injuries in Canada (including data from all P/Ts).</p>	1	<p>0.00 = No tracking of impaired driving statistics or tracked data are more than four years old, 0.50 = Tracked data do not cover all P/Ts, are not publicly reported or are more than three years old, 1.00 = Comprehensive data are tracked, publicly reported and are less than three years old.</p>	1
4. Health & Safety Messaging	10		1
4.1. Status of enhanced alcohol labelling components	3.50		0
<p>4. 1ai. Legislation for enhanced alcohol labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had legislation in place that would allow for enhanced alcohol labelling components.</p>	0.30	<p>0.00 = no legislation for enhanced alcohol labeling components, 0.30= legislation for enhanced alcohol labeling components.</p>	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>4.1aii. Status of alcohol warning labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) evidence-based alcohol warning labels, developed independently from the alcohol industry, across a range of topics as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.95	+0.20 warning on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.15 warning on alcohol use and health risks, +0.15 warning on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.15 alcohol use and violence, +0.15 warning on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.15 warning on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g.FASD/FAS).	0
<p>4.1aiii. Status of standard drink labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) standard drink information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.95	0.00 = no standard drink information on alcohol containers, 0.95 = legislated standard drink information on alcohol containers.	0
<p>4.1aiv. Status of national alcohol guidance labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) national alcohol guidance information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.95	0.00 = no guidance information on alcohol containers, 0.95 = guidance information on alcohol containers.	0
<p>4.1av. Status of calorie labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) calorie information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.35	0.00 = no calorie information on alcohol containers, 0.35 = calorie information on alcohol containers.	0
<p>4.2. Quality of enhanced alcohol labelling components</p>	3.5		0
<p>4.2a. Adequacy of label messages The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had at least one enhanced alcohol labeling component that contained an adequate message that would support consumers in making an informed health decision regarding use of the product.</p>	1.25	0.00 = label messaging is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 1.25 = label messaging is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice.	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>4.2b. Rotation of warning messages The jurisdiction was scored on whether their health warning messages on alcohol labels rotated across all alcohol products at least annually in such a way that warning messages could not be selectively applied to certain products. Note: standard drink information, national alcohol guidance information and calorie information should be applied to all beverage products.</p>	0.75	0.00 = label messaging is not rotating or no enhanced label component, 0.75 = label incorporates rotating messaging.	0
<p>4.2c. Use of pictorials on labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had at least one enhanced alcohol labelling component that was supported by a pictorial such as an image, graphics, icon etc.</p>	0.25	0.00 = label does not include graphics or no enhanced label component, 0.25 = label incorporates graphics.	0
<p>4.2d. Prominence of labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had at least one enhanced labelling component that was displayed prominently using contrasting colours, occupying at minimum 30% of the display panel and legible under customary conditions of purchase and use (e.g. a min of 6 point font). Prominence was specifically defined as front-of-package for alcohol warning messages.</p>	1.25	0.00 = label messaging is not prominent or no enhanced label component, 1.25 = label messaging is prominent.	0
<p>4.3. Comprehensiveness of Health and Safety Messaging</p>	3		1
<p>4.3ai. Public health media campaigns specific to alcohol The jurisdiction was scored based on whether Health Canada developed/ran or funded on-going annual health and safety media campaigns specific to alcohol, beyond the holiday season which were developed free of industry involvement and contained adequate health messaging (e.g. PSAs disseminated via mainstream media)</p>	1.4	0.00 = no annual media campaigns specific to alcohol or campaigned involved industry or contained inadequate messaging, 1.40 = Annual public health media campaigns specific to alcohol that were developed independently from the alcohol industry and contain adequate health messaging.	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>4.3a.ii. Comprehensiveness of the Health Canada health and safety campaign Jurisdiction was scored on the variation in health and safety topics included in the health and safety campaign.</p>	0.6	+0.15 warning on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.09 warning on alcohol use and health risks, +0.09 warning on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.09 warning on alcohol use and violence, +0.09 warning on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.09 warning on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g. FASD/FAS).	0
<p>4.3b. Health Canada alcohol-specific website content The jurisdiction was scored on whether the primary Health Canada website (e.g., Canada.ca) including a range of evidence-based information related to risks of alcohol use</p>	1	+ 0.195 alcohol use and cancer risk, + 0.115 alcohol use and health risks, + 0.115 alcohol use among youth and young adults (MLA laws and health impacts), +0.115 alcohol use and violence, + 0.115 alcohol use and impaired driving, + 0.115 alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (FASD/FAS). +0.115 treatment resources +0.115 national alcohol guidance	1
<p>5. Physical Availability</p>	10		10
<p>5.1. Government controls on commercial alcohol imports</p>	7		7
<p>5.1a. Controls on commercial imports Jurisdiction was scored on whether commercial alcohol products from outside Canada are required by law to be imported by a government authority.</p>	7	0.00 = no legislation requiring all commercially imported alcohol be imported exclusively via government authority, 3.50 = commercial alcohol must be imported via government authority as inscribed in legislation but with exceptions, 7.00 = all commercial alcohol must be imported exclusively via government authority as inscribed in legislation.	7

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
5.2 Government controls on personal alcohol imports	3		3
5.2a. Controls on personal imports The jurisdiction was scored on whether they set maximum duty exempt personal alcohol import volumes for absences greater than 48 hours that effectively discourage cross border shopping (E.g. no duty free alcohol for absence less than 48 hours and a maximum of 1.14L of spirits, 1.5L wine and 8.5L beer for absences exceeding 48 hours)	3	0.00 = No restrictions on duty free personal alcohol import volumes or import volumes set to a level that could encourage cross-border shopping, 3.00 = Duty free personal import volumes are set to effectively discourage cross-border shopping.	3
6. Alcohol Control System	10		1.15
6.1. Federal Alcohol Act	1		0
6.1a. Intent/mandate of the Federal Alcohol Act Jurisdiction was scored on whether the intent of Federal Alcohol Act includes explicit mandate/intent related to protection of public health.	1	0.00 = no stated public health mandate in Alcohol Act, 1.00 = stated public health mandate in Alcohol Act.	0
6.2. Comprehensiveness of Federal Alcohol Act	3.5		0
6.2a1-a10. Components of Federal Alcohol Act The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had an Alcohol Act that included evidenced based policy areas: a1. pricing and taxation a2. marketing and advertising controls a3. impaired driving countermeasures a4. health and safety messaging a4. physical availability a6. alcohol control system a7. minimum legal age a8. national alcohol strategy a9. screening and treatment interventions a10. monitoring and reporting	3.5	Federal Alcohol Act that includes the following policy areas: +0.77 for Pricing and taxation, +0.51 for Marketing and advertising controls, +0.35 for Impaired driving countermeasures, +0.34 for Health and safety messaging, +0.32 for Physical availability, +0.31 for Control system, +0.27 for Minimum legal age, +0.23 for National alcohol strategy, +0.22 for Screening and treatment interventions, +0.19 for Monitoring and reporting. Note: Scores reflect the CAPE domain weights; total points up to a max of 3.5	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
6.3. Federal government control over alcohol	3.5		0.75
<p>6.3a. Preserving P/T government alcohol monopolies (e.g. financial incentives or tax breaks) The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal incentives, such as tax breaks or other financial incentives, or other measures for maintaining government control over the retail sale and distribution of alcohol at the provincial/territorial level.</p>	1.5	0.00 = No federal incentives to encourage P/T government control of the distribution and sale of alcohol, 1.50 = Federal incentives to encourage P/T government control of the distribution and sale of alcohol.	0
<p>6.3b. Trade law exemptions 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>	1.5	0.00 = no trade law exemptions to protect public health and safety, 0.75 = trade law exemptions do exist in order to protect public health and safety, 1.50 = trade law exemptions, specific to alcohol, exist in order to protect public health and safety.	0.75
<p>6.3c. Control of Duty-Free alcohol outlets 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.</p>	0.5	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 up to a maximum of 0.5 points.	0
6.4. Public health-informed policy decisions	2		0.4
<p>6.4a. Public health input on alcohol policy The jurisdiction was scored on whether there is legislation requiring public health guidance or input from the ministry of health/public health stakeholders for decision-making and legislative changes around alcohol policies.</p>	1	0.00 = No legislation requiring health/public health involvement, 1.00 = Legislation requiring health/public health involvement in decision-making and legislative changes around alcohol policies.	0
<p>6.4b. Targeted public consultation Jurisdiction scored on whether there is a formal process for engaging underrepresented groups in public consultation pertaining to alcohol policy changes (e.g. a process for engaging non-industry stakeholder groups including outreach for public input to any priority group beyond industry stakeholders).</p>	0.6	0.00 = No targeted public engagement, 0.60 = Targeted public engagement for engaging stakeholders beyond industry groups.	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>6.4c. Transparency of lobbying by alcohol industry Jurisdiction was scored on whether they had a legislated centralized online public reporting system for industry lobbying activities at the federal level that is geared to the lay public.</p>	0.4	<p>0.00 = no centralized, user-friendly public reporting of industry lobbying, 0.40 = industry lobbying activities are accessible and transparently reported in centralized online platform.</p>	0.4
<p>7. Minimum Legal Age (MLA)</p>	10		0
<p>7.1. Federal legal age for the sale of alcohol</p>	9		0
<p>7.1a. Level of legal age for the sale of alcohol The jurisdiction was scored on the level of the minimum age they set for individuals to whom alcohol can be lawfully sold alcohol under the Criminal Code.</p>	9	<p>0.00 = No minimum age or a minimum age of 17 or younger, 3.00 = 18 years*, 5.00 = 19 years*, 7.00 = 20 years*, 9.00 = 21 years. *An additional 1.00 point was given if the jurisdiction strengthened minimum age policies by granting graduated access to alcohol by way of stepped restrictions based on strength of alcohol, volume of alcohol or hours of availability.</p>	0
<p>7.2. Level of legal age for alcohol sales on federally controlled areas</p>	1		0
<p>7.2a. Level of legal age for the sale of alcohol on federally controlled areas Jurisdictions were scored on the level of the minimum age for individuals to whom alcohol can be lawfully sold under the Criminal Code on federal controlled land/waters.</p>	1	<p>0.00= No minimum age or a minimum age of 17 or younger, 0.25 = 18 years*, 0.50 = 19 years*, 0.75 = 20 years*, 1.00 = 21 years. *An additional 0.125 points were given if the jurisdiction strengthened minimum age policies by granting graduated access to alcohol by way of stepped restrictions based on strength of alcohol, volume of alcohol or hours of availability on federally controlled lands/waters.</p>	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
8. National Alcohol Strategy	10		4
8.1 Status of the national alcohol strategy	3		0
8.1a. Status of national alcohol strategy The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had an alcohol focused public facing strategy or action plan that addresses alcohol as a public health issue. The jurisdiction was scored against an ideal of a standalone national alcohol strategy/action plan that was developed independently from the alcohol industry.	3	0.00 = No national strategy that includes alcohol or the strategy was drafted by/with industry, 1.50 = A national addictions, mental health, public health or other strategy that includes alcohol that was not drafted by/with industry, 3.00 = A standalone national alcohol strategy or action plan that was not drafted by/with industry.	0
8.2. Comprehensiveness of the alcohol strategy	4		4
8.2a1-a10. Components of alcohol strategy The jurisdiction was scored on whether the above-mentioned strategy included a wide range of evidence-based alcohol policy interventions and recommendations (i.e., CAPE P/T policy domains) a1. pricing and taxation a2. physical availability a3. alcohol control system a4. impaired driving countermeasures a5. marketing and advertising controls a6. minimum legal age a7. health and safety messaging a8. liquor law enforcement a9. screening and treatment interventions a10. monitoring and reporting.	4	+ 0.82 for pricing and taxation recommendations, + 0.71 for physical availability recommendations, + 0.39 for alcohol control system recommendations, + 0.38 impaired driving countermeasures recommendations, + 0.38 for marketing and advertising controls recommendations, + 0.32 for minimum legal age recommendations, + 0.31 for health and safety messaging recommendations, + 0.28 for liquor law enforcement recommendations, + 0.24 for screening and treatment interventions recommendations, + 0.18 for monitoring and reporting recommendations. Note: Scores reflect the CAPE P/T domain weights; total points up to a max of 4	4
8.3. Implementation of national alcohol strategy	3		0
8.3a. Federal strategy funding The jurisdiction was scored on whether there are dedicated federal funds to develop a fully funded national alcohol strategy.	0.75	0.00 = No national alcohol strategy, funding from industry, or strategy is not funded, 0.375 = Partial federal funding or funding is part of a larger addictions, mental health, or other strategy funding portfolio (e.g. no project/activity funding), 0.75 = Strategy is fully federally funded.	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
<p>8.3b. Federal strategy leadership The jurisdiction was scored on whether the National Alcohol Strategy has an identified leader (individual position or working group) to implement the strategy. Strategy leadership must be free of alcohol industry involvement.</p>	0.75	0.00 = No strategy, no identified strategy leader or strategy leadership includes membership from the alcohol industry, 0.75 = Has an identified leader to implement the strategy and the leader is independent from the alcohol industry.	0
<p>8.3ci. Implementation timeline The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had an implementation timeline for their strategy (e.g. 5-year timeline) that was set independently from the alcohol industry.</p>	0.375	0.00 = No strategy, no implementation timeline or the implementation timeline was set by/with industry, 0.375 = Jurisdiction has an implementation timeline for their strategy.	0
<p>8.3cii. Implementation assessment The jurisdiction was scored on the rigor with which they monitor and publicly report the implementation of the national alcohol strategy. The jurisdiction was scored against an ideal of an on-going implementation assessment that examines implementation through the life of the strategy, beyond one time point in time. Implementation assessments must be free of industry involvement and publicly reported in order to be scored.</p>	0.375	0.00 = No strategy, no public facing assessment(s) or assessment plan or the assessment plan involves industry, 0.1875 = There is a one-time public facing implementation assessment or assessment plan for the alcohol strategy that is free of industry involvement, 0.375 = There is regular or reoccurring public facing implementation assessments of the alcohol strategy (e.g. every 3 or 5 years) that are free of industry involvement.	0
<p>8.3d. Alcohol strategy endorsement The jurisdiction was scored on whether the alcohol strategy was federally endorsed.</p>	0.75	0.00 = strategy not endorsed, 0.75 = Strategy is endorsed by federal government.	0
<p>8.3e. Penalty -- Recency of alcohol strategy The jurisdiction was scored on how recently the national alcohol strategy had been developed or updated.</p>	-1	0.00 points were deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was created or updated in the past 5 years, 0.50 points were deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was developed or last updated 6-9 years ago, 1.00 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.	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
9. Screening and Treatment Interventions	10		6.65
9.1. National alcohol guidance	3		1.75
9.1a. Development of national alcohol guidance The jurisdiction was scored on whether there is federal funding to support development of national guidance on alcohol and health developed independently from alcohol industry interests.	1.75	0.00 = no funding to develop guidance or industry involved in development of guidance, 1.75 = federal funding available for guidance developed independent of industry.	1.75
9.1b. Endorsement of national alcohol guidance The jurisdiction was scored on whether national alcohol guidance developed free from industry, were endorsed at the federal level.	1.25	0.00 = guidance not endorsed at federal level, 1.25 = guidance endorsed at federal level.	0
9.2. Federal funding for SBIR initiatives at P/T level	2		2
9.2a. Federal support for P/T SBIR initiatives The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide funding for provincial/territorial level SBIR initiatives either specifically or as part of a comprehensive mental health or problematic substance package (e.g. transfers of health funds).	2	0.00 = no federal funding available, 2.00 = federal funding available to provinces and/or territories for alcohol SBIR initiatives.	2
9.3. Federal SBIR initiatives	1.4		1.4
9.3ai. SBIR initiatives for corrections populations The jurisdiction was scored on whether they conduct SBIR within populations under federal administration, such as corrections populations.	0.7	0.00 = no tools, 0.35 = general counselling programs only, 0.70 = alcohol specific SBIR initiatives.	0.7
9.3a.ii. SBIR initiatives for military populations The jurisdiction was scored on whether they conduct SBIR within populations under federal administration, such as military population.	0.7	0.00 = no tools, 0.35 = general counselling programs only, 0.70 = alcohol specific SBIR initiatives.	0.7
9.4. Federal funding for treatment Initiatives	2		0
9.4a. Federal support for P/T treatment initiatives The jurisdiction was scored on whether they have earmarked funds for supporting alcohol-specific treatment at the provincial and territorial level (e.g. health transfer funds).	2	0.00 = no earmarked funds, 2.00 = earmarked funds for supporting alcohol treatment at P/T level.	0

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
9.5. Federal treatment initiatives	1.4		1.4
9.5ai. Treatment services for corrections populations The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide treatment services within populations under federal administration, such as corrections populations (beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model).	0.7	0.00 = no treatment services, 0.70 = alcohol-specific treatment services beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model.	0.7
9.5aii. Treatment services for military populations The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide treatment services within populations under federal administration, such as military populations (beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model).	0.7	0.00 = no treatment services, 0.70 = alcohol-specific treatment services beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model.	0.7
9.6. Federal tracking and reporting of SBIR and Treatment	0.2		0.1
9.6a. Tracking and reporting of SBIR and treatment for federal populations The jurisdiction was scored on whether they conduct tracking and reporting of SBIR and treatment for populations under federal administration such as corrections and military.	0.2	0.00 = no tracking or reporting of SBIR and treatment, 0.10 = tracking and reporting of one population, 0.20 = tracking and reporting of both populations.	0.1
10. Monitoring and Reporting	10		8.84
10.1 Comprehensiveness of national alcohol monitoring program	4		4
10.1ai. Alcohol consumption indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks: ai: alcohol consumption by sales and survey data,	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.	0.5
10.1aii. Morbidity indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that track alcohol-related morbidity indicators.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.	0.5
10.1aiii. Mortality indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks alcohol-related mortality indicators.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.	0.5

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
10.1aiv. Crime indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks alcohol-related crime indicators.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.	0.5
10.1av. Cost indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks alcohol-related cost indicators.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.	0.5
10.1avi. Policy change indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks policy change indicators and the health impacts of these changes.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.	0.5
Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy	1	Synergy points: An additional 1.0 points for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 6 alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that they fund.	1
10.2. Accessibility of reporting	3		2.842
10.2ai. Transparency of reporting - alcohol consumption indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.	0.25
10.2aii. Transparency of reporting - morbidity indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.	0.25
10.2aiii. Transparency of reporting - mortality indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.	0.25
10.2aiv. Transparency of reporting - crime indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.	0.25

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
10.2av. Transparency of reporting - cost indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.	0.25
10.2avi. Transparency of reporting - policy change Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.	0.25
Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy	0.5	An additional 0.50 points awarded for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 6 alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that they publicly report.	0.5
10.2bi. Frequency of reporting - alcohol consumption indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol consumption by sales and survey data.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.	0.125
10.2bii. Frequency of reporting - morbidity indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related morbidity indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.	0.1
10.2biii. Frequency of reporting - mortality indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related mortality indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.	0.125
10.2biv. Frequency of reporting - crime indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related crime indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.	0.125
10.2bv. Frequency of reporting - cost indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related cost indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.	0.1
10.2bvi. Frequency of reporting - policy change The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on policy change indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.	0.1

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal) with Scores

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN	SCORE
Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy	0.25	An additional 0.25 points awarded for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 6 alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that they report on annually.	0.17
10.3. Leadership for Alcohol Monitoring and Reporting	3		2
10.3ai. Central reporting The Jurisdiction was scored on whether they implemented public centralized reporting for alcohol-related indicators (e.g. alcohol consumption, harms, costs and policies).	1	0.00 = No centralized system, 1.00 = Central public database or reporting system.	0
10.3aii. Leadership for alcohol monitoring and reporting The Jurisdiction was scored on whether there was an identifiable leader responsible for monitoring and reporting alcohol-related harm and consumption.	1	0.00 = No organization, committee or individual leader identified, 1.00 = Readily identifiable leadership.	1
10.3aiii. Knowledge translation in past two years The Jurisdiction was scored on whether there have been any active KT activities on alcohol indicators.	1	0.00 = No knowledge products or activities in the past two years, 1.00 = Active knowledge translation in the past two years.	1