

## Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation (CAPE) 3.0

### Results from Nunavut

The Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation (CAPE) provides rigorous assessments of how well each level of government in Canada is implementing policies proven to reduce harm from alcohol use. This is the third edition of the CAPE project; a project which has a track record of strengthening Canada's response to alcohol harm. Policy data for CAPE 3.0 were collected between June 1 and December 1, 2022.

#### Why it Matters: Annual alcohol consumption, harms and costs in NU

##### Alcohol consumption, 2020/2021

NU: 246 standard drinks per person aged 15+

Canada: 487 standard drinks per person aged 15+

Source: Statistics Canada. Table 10-10-0010-01 Sales of alcoholic beverages types by liquor authorities and other retail outlets, by value, volume, and absolute volume.

##### Alcohol health harms, 2020

3,092 ER & hospital visits in NU

59 deaths in NU

Source: Canadian Substance Use Costs and Harms. [www.csuch.ca](http://www.csuch.ca)

##### Alcohol deficit, 2020/2021

+ \$5.4M alcohol revenues

- \$124M alcohol harm costs

= -\$119M total alcohol deficit

Which is equal to -\$17.92 per standard drink sold.

Sources:

- Statistics Canada. Table 10-10-0010-01 Sales of alcoholic beverages types by liquor authorities and other retail outlets, by value, volume, and absolute volume.
- Canadian Substance Use Costs and Harms.
- Statistics Canada. Table 10-10-0012-01 Net income of liquor authorities and government revenue from sale of alcoholic beverages (x 1,000).

#### What can be done: an alcohol policy approach

Evidence-based alcohol policies are the most effective way to reduce harm from alcohol. The scores presented in this summary represent the degree to which best practice policies have been implemented.

## CAPE 3.0 results: how does NU compare?

- BC: 36%
- AB: 34%
- SK: 36%
- MB: 44%
- ON: 40%
- QC: 42%
- NB: 35%
- NS: 38%
- PE: 37%
- NL: 41%
- YT: 33%
- NT: 32%
- NU: 34%

## NU's CAPE Scores: What's Possible?

If Nunavut implemented all the best existing policies across Canada's provinces and territories, their score could change from 34% (F) to 80% (A-). If we graded NU against best existing policies across provinces and territories, their score would still only be 42% (F).

## CAPE policy domains: do they all have the same impact?

The 11 policy domains in this assessment form part of a comprehensive and synergistic approach to preventing and reducing different types of alcohol harms. Policies examined fall under provincial or territorial control, and each domain reflects the current evidence and is weighted based on its effectiveness and scope of reach. This results in a ranked order from one (i.e., highest overall impact) through 11 (see next page). However, all the domains are necessary to create a health-focused alcohol policy environment. To read more, see Project Methodology.

## What NU is doing well: Selected examples

### Policy domain 2: Physical Availability

NU has the lowest outlet density of any jurisdiction in Canada. NU has powers to limit the number and placement of all premise types. There are limits on off-premise days of sale and on-premise alcohol takeout and delivery is prohibited.

### Policy domain 3: Control System

Off-premise retail outlets in NU are 100% government-owned and run and the government always acts as the wholesaler in the supply chain. Off-premise alcohol sales are not permitted online or by retailers selling other goods (e.g. grocery stores).

### Policy domain 10: Alcohol Strategy

NU has a funded and endorsed standalone alcohol action plan from 2016, developed independently of industry, that includes many key recommended policy areas such as pricing and control system. The plan incorporates assessment and has leadership from across government departments.

## Where NU needs work: Selected examples

### Policy domain 1: Pricing & Taxation

There is no minimum pricing in place for any alcohol sold in NU. There is no territorial sales tax applied to consumer goods, including alcohol, in NU and no alcohol-specific tax applied to any alcohol.

#### *NU Minimum Pricing in 2021/22*

Note: Price per standard drink for a common container size and beverage strength, expressed in 2021 dollars.

#### Off-premise (e.g., liquor stores)

Recommended minimum price: \$1.83

#### Actual prices:

- Beer: None
- Wine: None
- Spirits: None
- Coolers: None

#### On-premise (e.g. restaurants, bars)

Recommended minimum price: \$3.66

#### Actual prices:

- Beer: None
- Wine: None
- Spirits: None
- Coolers: None

### Policy domain 3: Control System

The alcohol regulator, NLCB, and retailer, NLCC, both report to the Department of Finance and neither includes health and safety in their mandate.

### Policy domain 4: Impaired Driving Countermeasures

There is no graduated licensing program in place in NU. There are no mandatory administrative licensing suspensions or vehicle impoundments for alcohol impaired drivers that escalate according to BAC level and repeat occurrences. There are no mandatory escalating interlock requirements for  $\geq 0.08\%$  BAC federal convictions. However, regional access to interlock programs is integral to the success of the policy.

## Steps NU can take to improve their CAPE policy scores

The policy domains below are listed in order of impact based on their effectiveness and scope.

Note: Grade ranges: A+ = 90-100%; A = 85-89%; A- = 80-84%; B+ = 77-79%; B = 73-76%; B- = 70-72%; C+ = 67-69%; C = 63-66%; C- = 60-62%; D+ = 57-59%; D = 53-56%; D- = 50-52%; F = 0-49%.

NU's CAPE 3.0 Score: 34% (F)

Policy domain 1: Pricing & Taxation

Score: 1% (F)

#### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Implement legislated minimum prices for all alcohol sold that are tied precisely (e.g. \$/L ethanol) to ethanol content. Set minimum prices at a rate per standard drink (e.g. 17.05mL ethanol) of at least \$2.04\* for alcohol sold at off-premise retail outlets and \$4.07\* for alcohol sold at on-premise establishments, after taxes, with automatic indexation (\*2023 price).
- Update general alcohol prices annually to ensure that all keep pace with NU-specific inflation, implement sales taxes for alcohol, and tax alcohol at a higher rate than other consumer goods.
- Set off-premise minimum retail markups to be at least 100% of the landed cost for each beverage type and maintain on-premise markups at or above the off-premise retail price.

Policy domain 2: Physical Availability

Score: 65% (C)

#### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Strengthen limits on outlet density for all premise types by setting in legislation.
- Reduce and legislate maximum trading hours allowed per week; restrict alcohol sales before 11:00am and after 8pm (off-premise retail outlets) and 1am (on-premise establishments). Prohibit alcohol home delivery, including by a third party, from off-premise retail outlets.

Policy domain 3: Control System

Score: 62% (C-)

#### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Appoint a health and/or safety-focused ministry to oversee alcohol regulation and distribution/retail.
- Maintain the existing government monopoly for alcohol retail. Prohibit alcohol sales in establishments such as spas and sporting facilities; phase out home-brew kits.
- Include protection of public health and safety as explicit mandate objectives for regulator and distributor/retailer; legislate earmarked funds for harm prevention, research, and treatment; transparently report industry lobbying via online public platform.

Policy domain 4: Impaired Driving Countermeasures

Score: 9% (F)

### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Implement graduated licensing program (GLP) with minimum start age of 16, stage 1 minimum of 12 months and stage 2 minimum of 24 months, and stage 2 night-time driving ban and passenger limit. Implement zero tolerance period with penalties to all GLP and new drivers with less than 5 years' experience.
- Impose increased penalties when presence of alcohol plus another drug is detected.
- Impose comprehensive mandatory ALS and AVI that escalate according to BAC level and repeat occurrences; record on drivers abstracts for at least 5 years.
- Require escalating completion of interlock program as relicensing condition (and based on performance criteria) for first and subsequent  $\geq 0.08\%$  BAC federal convictions; have interlock program enrollment incentives to discourage unlicensed/uninsured driving.

### Policy domain 5: Marketing & Advertising Controls

Score: 56% (D)

### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Implement restrictions on advertising quantity (e.g. ad bans and volume restrictions) for all advertisers (including non-licensees/third parties) and all media types.
- Enhance enforcement by hosting a responsive online complaint system. Set commensurate, escalating penalties for any violations.

### Policy domain 6: Minimum Legal Age

Score: 24% (F)

### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Increase minimum legal age to 21 for possession and purchase of alcohol; consider granting graduated access (i.e. restrictions based on alcohol strength or hours of sale).
- Prohibit policies permitting parents/guardians or other adults from providing alcohol to minors beyond the home.
- Require proof of age identification for anyone purchasing alcohol and 2-staged verification (i.e. when ordering and receiving order) for alcohol sales made remotely (e.g. online, via phone, etc.).

### Policy domain 7: Health & Safety Messaging

Score: 0% (F)

### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Implement enhanced alcohol labelling as a manufacturer requirement and mandatory onsite health and safety messaging (e.g. signage, posters) in all premises. Labels, signage, and messaging should include a variety of evidence-based warning messages (e.g. cancer risk, standard drinks, national alcohol guidance, calories), be prominently displayed and accompanied by pictorials, rotate across all products, and support consumers in making informed decisions about product use.
- Deliver a variety of ministry-led alcohol health and safety campaigns (beyond holiday themes) at least annually.

#### Policy domain 8: Liquor Law Enforcement

Score: 40% (F)

##### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Apply risk-based licensing and enforcement criteria to outlet and license holder characteristics to determine risk level for licensing conditions and enforcement schedules across all premises.
- Conduct off-premise compliance checks at least once a year, with more frequent checks based on risk level, and follow-up for failed compliance within 3 months and based on severity or number of violations. Implement checks at off-premise outlets for minimum legal age law compliance and introduce dedicated police inspection program for on-premise establishments.
- Strengthen mandatory, evidence-based alcohol sale and service training programs for all involved in the sale, service or delivery of alcohol by extending it to apply across all premises; require recertification at least every 2 years.

#### Policy domain 9: Screening and Treatment Interventions

Note: Treatment indicators measure existence of services only, not quantity or quality

Score: 24% (F)

##### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Formally adopt the most recent evidence-based national alcohol guidance with an official statement of support.
- Provide health professionals with screening, brief intervention, and referral (SBIR) training and ensure availability of in-person or online SBIR services with health professionals; develop and/or host online self-guided SBIR resources.
- Provide publicly funded withdrawal management/detox programs, outpatient treatment services and permanent managed alcohol programs.

#### Policy domain 10: Alcohol Strategy

Score: 70% (B-)

### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Strengthen the existing alcohol-specific strategy by including evidence-based public health policies on physical availability, marketing and advertising, minimum legal age, health and safety messaging, and monitoring and reporting, an implementation timeline, reoccurring public facing implementation assessments and updates at least every 5 years.

### Policy domain 11: Monitoring & Reporting

Score: 50% (D-)

### *Recommendations*

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

- Implement systematic and comprehensive tracking of all alcohol-related indicators (e.g., add drinking patterns and policy changes to existing indicators).
- Report annually on all indicators through centralized public database or reporting system (i.e. website), with leadership from government knowledge broker and tailored knowledge products or activities at least every 2 years.

### More CAPE products:

#### Provincial/Territorial

- Other P/T Results Summaries
- Policy Domain Results Summary
- Policy Scoring Rubric
- Methodology and Evidence
- Best Practice Policy Leaders

#### Federal

- Federal Results Summary
- Policy Domain Results
- Policy Scoring Rubric
- Methodology and Evidence
- Evidence-Based Recommendations for Labelling of Alcohol Products in Canada

To learn more about the Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation or to join our Community of Practice, visit [alcoholpolicy.cisur.ca](http://alcoholpolicy.cisur.ca) or email [cisur@uvic.ca](mailto:cisur@uvic.ca)

### 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 3.0: Findings from Nunavut. 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.